

the protocol. I feel that I should like to have an opportunity to confer with members of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no objection to the protocol going over. It has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations. There are eminent minority Members on that committee. I shall not press my request; but I give notice that the next time we have an executive session I shall insist on action.

RECESS

Mr. McKELLAR. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 24, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 23 (legislative day of March 5), 1942:

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Capt. Monroe Kelly to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 25th day of November 1941.

MARINE CORPS

Brig. Gen. John Marston to be a major general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 20th day of March 1942.

Brig. Gen. Alexander A. Vandegrift to be a major general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 20th day of March 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 23 (legislative day of March 5), 1942:

UNITED STATES HOUSING AUTHORITY

Herbert Emmerich to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority.

POSTMASTERS

Joseph H. Vachon, Saco, Maine.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 23, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who are the author and giver of every perfect gift, whose presence and power underlie all life, to Thee we pray. Because of Thy mercies we would offer to Thee the fruits of the spirit—love, long suffering, faithfulness, and temperance. Dear Lord, we confess that we too often forget the depth of sincerity, the influence of simplicity, and the conquering force of goodness. May we be clothed with that devotion which shall set forth in actual daily life the grandeur and beauty of character.

We pray for our entire citizenship that it may turn to its most impelling tasks without doubt or fear and with the deepest consciousness of its responsibility. Forbid that any section of our land should stand in the humiliating and dis-

treasing lurid lights of indifference or disunity. O God, others are suffering and waiting, others are surrendering life and love to preserve our heritage. Forbid that untrue criticism and weaknesses should come trooping into our Nation's soul. O America, be not disquieted within thee; hope thou in God, for we shall yet praise Him, who is the health of our countenance. Through Christ and in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 19, 1942, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution authorizing certain clerical changes in the enrollment of the bill (S. 2208) to further expedite the prosecution of the war.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1696. An act for the relief of Bessie Walden.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6005) entitled "An act to authorize cases under the Expediting Act of February 11, 1903, to be heard and determined by courts constituted in the same manner as courts constituted to hear and determine cases involving the constitutionality of acts of Congress"; disagreed to by the House, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. DANAHY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1057) entitled "An act to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2208) entitled "An act to further expedite the prosecution of the war."

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its disagreement to the House amendments numbered 32 and 47 to said bill.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Interior.

3. Department of Labor.
4. Department of the Treasury.
5. Federal Security Agency, Social Security Board.
6. The National Archives.

MILITARY AREAS OR ZONES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

MARCH 20, 1942.

The honorable the SPEAKER,

House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the special order agreed to on yesterday the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate the engrossed bill of the House of Representatives (H. R. 6758) entitled "An act to provide a penalty for violation of restrictions or orders with respect to persons entering, remaining in, leaving, or committing any act in military areas or zones," attested by the Secretary as having passed the Senate without amendment March 19 (legislative day of March 5), 1942.

Yours very truly,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,

Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted to him on March 19, 1942, he did on Friday, March 20, 1942, sign the enrolled bill of the House (H. R. 6758) to provide a penalty for violation of restrictions or orders with respect to persons entering or remaining in or leaving military areas or zones.

AMENDMENT OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6738) to limit the initial base pay of \$21 per month for enlisted men in the Army and Marine Corps to those of the seventh grade.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885) be, and it is hereby, amended by adding the words "of the seventh grade" after the word "men" in line 7 of said section.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the amendment?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, when the Selective Training and Service Act was passed, by some oversight or inadvertence a comma was inserted in the wrong place in section 12, and in construing the act the Comptroller General, by reason of the misplacement of that comma, held that soldiers in the seventh grade, which covers the selectees originally selected and all volunteers in the regular services, can be paid only \$21 per month. That is the part of the act which provides that they shall be paid that amount for the first 4 months.

The situation is simply this: The Army is trying to make up a number of divisions to be sent into foreign service to engage in expert and specific work that requires men who cannot afford to be taken out of industry and whom the Army cannot in fact take out of industry and put into such places. For instance,

it requires a mechanic with certain technical knowledge to put together an airplane that is shipped knocked down in a boat. The Army must have men of that type. If it took them, it would have to pay them \$21 per month under the law as it now exists.

Mr. MICHENER. Do I correctly understand the gentleman to say that by reason of wrong punctuation found in the law, the Comptroller General has construed the law differently than the House intended it to be construed?

Mr. MAY. That is exactly the situation. I think it occurred in the consideration of the conference report on the Selective Training and Service Act.

Mr. MICHENER. In other words, a semicolon was put in the bill when a comma should have been used?

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. Is the matter satisfactory to the minority members of the committee?

Mr. ANDREWS. The statement of the chairman is exactly correct.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of objecting, but I feel we can cut nonessential spending and give more money to our soldiers. I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs if it is not his opinion that Congress should at this time give careful consideration with a view to raising the basic pay of the privates in the Army.

Mr. MAY. I believe such a bill is pending in the House Committee on Military Affairs at this time. We plan to have hearings on it at such time as we can conveniently do so, considering the press of other important legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Naval Affairs be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House for the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

SECOND WAR POWERS BILL

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in enrolling the bill (S. 2208) to further expedite the prosecution of the war, the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to make all necessary corrections in title and section numbers and cross references as may be necessary by reason of the omission from the enrolled bill of title VIII.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an article from the Petroleum World entitled "A Job for the Military," and in another extension to include an article from the San Francisco Call-Bulletin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative program today and following any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the Record today an article from the Petroleum World, entitled "A Job for the Military." It appears that our petroleum interests in California are not being properly patrolled, and this article calls the attention of our people to the situation existing there.

A second extension of my remarks has to do with the shortage of rubber. It is stated by the writer of the article I am including in my remarks that we can reclaim 450,000 tons of rubber. If this can be done, I see no reason why it should not be done. An ear should be lent to such suggestions as this. I hope all the Members of the House will read the article.

At the conclusion of the legislative program today I expect to address the House on the subject of the 40-hour week, and I expect to tell Mr. Phil Murray some of the things he ought to know.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein an editorial from the San Francisco Examiner entitled "Fair Trade Practices."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include an editorial from the San Francisco Call-Bulletin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that the Congress recess and go home in order to learn of the attitude of the people on the question of strikes, the 40-hour week, war production, and war profits. I would hate to think that the House is so blind and insensible that it does not already know the wishes of the people on these questions. The wishes of the people have been obvious for a long time, and a Member of Congress who does not now know the will of the people when it is so crystal clear must have an amazing method of isolating himself from the people whom he represents.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion it will be an outrage if this House votes to recess before voting on legislation effectively suspending the 40-hour week, speeding up production, and eliminating industrial graft and excess profits. Effective legislation should be passed immediately, not at some indefinite future date. MacArthur and his men did not take a recess. They did what was necessary and they did it without delay or hesitation. This Congress can do no less.

For my part, I shall vote against a recess until we have voted on the legislation referred to and I ask for a roll call vote on the record at the proper time on the question of a recess.

In regard to strikes and racketeering, it is only fair to point out that the House last December passed effective legislation, and the bill now reposes in the Senate.

JESSE H. POWELL

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COCHRAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LETTER TO WAYNE COY

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VORYS of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Roger Babson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and I also ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes today following any previous special order and after the regular legislative program of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SCHULTE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following any previous special order and the regular legislative program of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to put my head into the lion's mouth and to protest against an editorial appearing in the Washington Daily News entitled "The Speaker Squawks."

In my judgment, the statement of the Speaker of the House commenting on agitation going on throughout the country and pointing out the vast importance of national unity was an altogether proper statement. I found nothing whatsoever in that statement objecting to fair and honest criticism of Congress. In my further judgment, the position of the National Legislature in the United States, regardless of what the opinion of Members of the House or of other people may be about specific issues, is of the most fundamental importance to the preservation of democracy. The very first necessity of dictatorship is destruction of the national legislative body. In my judgment, all the Speaker asked for and all that I am asking for is that people tell the truth when they offer criticism. The Congress can and should stand all honest criticism. But neither this nor any other institution can stand continued

misrepresentation. In this very editorial Congress is taken to task for having provided for "self-allocated pensions for Congressmen." I am wondering whether the writer of the editorial knows that that measure was wiped off the statute books. I believe we must have criticism, we must have debate, we must have disagreements, but we and everyone else must understand that nothing is to be gained for our country by either new dealers or old dealers trying to use this war to try to prosecute their own aims. And when anyone says, "We can have national unity as soon as Congress does just what I want them to do," he is asking something which is quite impossible in a democracy. No one can have his way altogether.

The Speaker of the House is the symbol of the House. I rise to express my protest against this editorial.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Archibald MacLeish.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of an editorial from the Boston Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

JAPANESE LANGUAGE SCHOOLS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, it has been found that the so-called Japanese-language schools have been used for years for the purpose of indoctrinating the American-born children of Japanese descent with the ideals of that country and their ancestry, in order to fasten upon them such ties to Japan as may make them suitable material either for the Japanese Army or Navy, their spy system, or fifth-column work. Many of the graduates of these Japanese-language schools have been required to go to Japan for 1 or 2 years' training and then return to the United States.

Doubtless a good number of those postgraduates are ready and willing to carry out any orders which may be given to them by the Japanese Government, and yet they retain their American citizenship, granted them by virtue of their birth in this country. Similar schools may be operating in this country under the aegis of the Nazi, Fascist, or other foreign governments—in the future, if not now.

The two bills which I have introduced are for the direct purpose of wiping out these educational mills for the production of American-born fifth columnists and saboteurs. I hope that one of these bills will be adopted by the Congress and approved by the President without delay, and I hope that the stronger of the two

will be the one adopted. To let these things go on without legal restriction would be the height of folly.

VALIDITY OF PROTEST AGAINST CERTAIN LABOR LAWS

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RIZLEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a resolution adopted by the Independent Gas Association of Kansas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FORTY-HOUR WEEK MUST GO

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford the luxury of a privileged class in this country at a time when the Nation is fighting for its very life. That is why the 40-hour week must go. While our soldiers and sailors, our farmers and small business men, and millions of other American citizens are working long and sometimes unlimited hours to prepare the Nation for victory, we have a special group whose leaders declare that its members will not work more than 40 hours per week unless they receive a pay increase of 50 percent. I do not believe that the workingmen of this country want to put themselves in a privileged class. I think that they want to do their part without favoritism or special privileges.

I believe that if you would leave the matter to these patriotic American workingmen the vote would be overwhelming to do away with the 40-hour week. I believe that if the leaders of labor organizations are wise and farsighted they will agree with the almost unanimous sentiment of other Americans that for the duration of this emergency there must be no 40-hour week, no time and a half for overtime, and no special privileges for any group or class in this country.

LABOR RACKETEERS

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation are aroused because the labor racketeers are permitted to take advantage of the national emergency to force closed-shop agreements and other unjustifiable demands on industries engaged in war production. Each group and every individual in this country must be willing to make sacrifices to win this war. We must speedily increase war production. We cannot expect to obtain national unity and maximum production until Congress curbs the labor racketeers and the war profiteers.

The rank and file of labor are patriotic and willing to make sacrifices. It is the racketeers who are forcing the workers to pay tribute before they are permitted to contribute their skill toward increasing our war production. The 40-hour week should be suspended during this war period. The open shop must be preserved on Government contracts.

Industry and organized labor are not alone concerned in these wage agreements. The public everywhere is vitally concerned. The people of Nebraska are deeply concerned in the terms of the wage agreement now being negotiated in Detroit between General Motors and the C. I. O. They know they must help pay the bill.

The elimination of double time on Sundays will not satisfy the people of this Nation. If this Congress refuses to pass the necessary labor legislation, you may be assured an aroused public will send a Congress here that will take the necessary action.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ELLIOTT of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Nashville Tennessean.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Prof. R. A. Schwegler, Sr., of the University of Kansas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, also I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of an editorial from the Fort Scott Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

L. METCALFE WALLING

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked this time to read a paragraph from an editorial appearing in this morning's Washington Post, which is as follows:

MR. WALLING'S SMEAR

No more irresponsible statement has come to our attention since the war began than

that of L. Metcalfe Walling, recently appointed Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, before the National Consumers League in New York on Saturday. "The Nazi propaganda machine," Mr. Walling is quoted as saying, "is behind this whole movement to do away with wage-and-hour standards, although I cannot cite chapter and verse, and the newspapers have been taken in."

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we send a committee down to Mr. Walling and inform him that this Nation is at war, and at the same time invite him to the Capitol to appear before a committee and give that committee some of this valuable information which he claims to have.

LABOR IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McGEHEE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein extracts from two letters concerning reclamation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Minneapolis Daily Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

YOU CAN'T MAKE AIRPLANES OUT OF TAX EXEMPTIONS

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri recently sponsored a bill to exempt defense contractors, subcontractors, and sub-subcontractors from the payment of one and a half to two billions of State taxes. On this floor last Tuesday he said that if his bill were to be passed it would pay for 20,000 fighting airplanes, 180 destroyers, or 333 submarines. He implied that if we pass the bill we will get that many airplanes, destroyers, or submarines.

If he is right, then we ought to pass two or three bills like this. If he is right, we ought to exempt all these contractors from all of their Federal taxes, too. But Donald Nelson knows, and we know, that you cannot make planes or destroyers or submarines either by passing bills or by exempting anybody from taxes. The gentleman from Missouri should find that out.

Planes and destroyers and submarines can be made only out of materials which have to be transported to the places

where they are needed, and by workers who must live in security. The States must keep the roads in repair for the heavy trucks. They must maintain police and fire protection and sewage disposal and other services for defense workers. If they do not we can all expect the defense program to slow down. If we take away the funds with which they maintain these services, we can expect some hearty guffaws from Berlin and Tokyo, but we can hardly expect any applause from General MacArthur.

It was a mistake to introduce this bill. A worse mistake would be to bring it up for a vote. The worst possible mistake would be to pass it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous consent requests. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and that I may be permitted to insert in each of those a short letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including in the Appendix a letter from the Pennsylvania State administrator of the National Youth Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein an editorial on compulsory savings appearing in the Oregon Democrat News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COPENLAND was granted permission to extend his own remarks.)

HON. PHILIP F. LA FOLLETTE

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks and include therein an article written by former Gov. Philip F. La Follette.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GEHRMANN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LABOR IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to read to the House a telegram addressed to me this morning:

DETROIT, MICH., March 22, 1942.

Representative HOWARD SMITH,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Your recent recommendations to Congress are most heartening. Since our last meeting we have been forced to operate continually under severe and never-ending attacks by antique craft labor union in spite of 100-percent cooperation under our own Congress of Industrial Organizations contract. Since December 1, we have started mass production of 1,500 housing units, nearly one-half on direct and urgent War Department orders for Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., Army post. Each of our projects and

all our plants have been and are now harassed by pickets who make every effort to cripple our efforts. Their unwarranted attacks have seriously hampered our production. These pickets represent no Currier employees; they make no demands, formal or informal, on management; they simply wreck production and stifle our sincere attempt to help house America's defenders in factory and field. Is there no recourse from such irresponsible action? Does not this case make liars of labor leaders who solemnly promise full defense cooperation? Does it not arouse natural suspicion of fifth-column activity? We urge an immediate and thorough investigation of this pitiful condition which harasses American efforts and seems to give aid and comfort to our enemies.

CURRIER LUMBER Co.,
P. J. CURRIER, President.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two editorials from the Chicago Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

MR. GEORGE E. SULLIVAN

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, on March 11 I made a speech on the floor and then inserted certain names of those who have been used by Mr. George Sylvester Viereck, the chief Nazi operative in the United States. Among those names was included that of Mr. George E. Sullivan, who has called to my attention, by a very strong letter, that he was not "Slap-Happy Eddie" Sullivan, and that he was not an investigator for the Dies committee. The boys in the office inadvertently used the name George E. Sullivan instead of the Sullivan who was so known and who was an investigator for the Dies committee.

I desire to correct the RECORD to show that Mr. George E. Sullivan is not "Slap-Happy Eddie" Sullivan and was not an investigator for the Dies committee. As I stated, Mr. George E. Sullivan was attorney for former Congressman Thorkelson, as he admits in his letter. I also recollect that he wrote an article which Thorkelson inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD June 7, 1940, which article with others were disseminated by James True and other intolerant propagandists.

In his letter Mr. George E. Sullivan states to me that he is not a Nazi and that he is more opposed to them than I am, and that he has written a certain book, which I regret I did not have time to read. But from his letter, unfortunately, it does appear that he does believe in the Nazi ideology.

I hope that all these gentlemen by this time will come to realize that this is not for the best interest of the country—to create discord, prejudice, and intolerance in our country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter replying to some information about Puerto Rico, published in the magazine the New Republic.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement filed by me with the Ways and Means Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit three requests. I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and further extend in the Appendix of the RECORD matter that I extended in the Appendix of the RECORD on the 16th of March.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Second, Mr. Speakers, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD; and third, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend these remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LABOR POLICIES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] referred to the statement made on Saturday by Mr. Walling, in which he said that these letters demanding labor legislation we have been receiving are inspired by the Nazis. Mr. Walling is either unaware of the authorship of those letters or he does not tell us the fact. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] suggested that Walling be called before a committee of the House. Anticipating there would be some such suggestion, I prepared a resolution this morning asking for the appointment of a committee so that this gentleman may come up and be sworn and that we may learn whether he is willfully misrepresenting what he does know or whether he does not know what he is talking about, or whether he is just spreading propaganda to keep us from representing our constituents here.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the most conclusive proof that the country is aroused about this labor situation is the fact that the high moguls of the C. I. O. met in Washington yesterday, came here from all over the country, and they are offering to give up Sunday double time and the extension of the closed

shop for the duration. They know that this country is aroused but they want to hold the big baby, time and a half for over 40 hours, and that is the thing when that bill was passed that that was intended to discourage the employer most positively. I sat in on all the joint hearings of the two committees. The idea was that it would spread labor and penalize the employer if he worked men over 40 hours. Now they insist on penalizing Uncle Sam, the greatest employer, and make a racket of it in a national emergency when hours of labor are badly needed and when hourly pay is superhigh. We should not recess till this law is set aside.

[Here the gavel fell.]

LABOR-UNION DUES

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I have numerous letters and affidavits from Oklahoma indicating that it is a widespread, if not universal, practice on defense projects in Oklahoma to make exorbitant fees and dues a condition of receiving employment on those projects, and also indicating that a man receiving employment on that basis, after paying such tribute, very frequently as soon as the tribute was completely paid was put off the job in order that a new employee might be put on, who would pay another exorbitant fee. Indications are that this is of such widespread practice that, in my judgment, the Congress should investigate the circumstances on all the defense projects. I propose to introduce a resolution indicating the need of such investigation and providing such an investigation with a view to bringing out legislation that will put a stop to such practice.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. GREEN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a resolution from the Citrus Exchange.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I quarrel with no man because of difference of opinion. While I might not like what some people say, I do not think we can afford to dignify a charge similar to the one against which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] complained of a few minutes ago by seriously considering a congressional investigation.

There has been talk about the House taking a spring recess. That is fine. I would like to see every Member given a couple of weeks' rest, but we might just as well settle that question in our minds right now. Public sentiment is not going to let us go home until we do something with reference to the labor situation. I have said in the past and I say again that next to the stand of MacArthur and his men in the Philippines this expression of discontent and dissatisfaction on the part of the public is the finest exhibition of America in action that I have witnessed in many years.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Walling is the administrator of the wage-hour law.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow after all business on the Speaker's table has been disposed of and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF WEEK

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the able majority leader what the program for the rest of the week will be, and also if he can indicate in any way what the program will be for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the program for the rest of the week is about as follows: Today is District day. On tomorrow the Interior Department appropriation will be taken up, and the consideration of that bill will probably require Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. Then there is a deficiency bill, and, of course, the time that is taken up depends on when the Interior appropriation bill will be finished. The deficiency bill contains a \$17,000,000,000-plus recommendation recently made by the President. It is hoped that bill will be finished by Saturday. I do not know whether that will take all day Friday and

Saturday or not. It is hoped that it may be finished by Saturday. There will be some conference reports, at least one, that will come up. Outside of that, I know of no other legislation.

Mr. MAY. May I inquire if the deficiency bill that is to come up contains any items other than the \$17,000,000,000?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think it does; yes.

Mr. MAY. I would like to know what they are.

Mr. TABER. There are 15 pages of other items. Some of them are small, some of them large, but none of them very large. There are about \$700,000,000 in estimates for the Navy in addition to the \$17,000,000,000 for the Army.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman from New York.

So far as next week is concerned, I have no knowledge of any legislation coming up next week. Of course, the Members have worked very hard, and the House has done a very good job, as we look over the whole picture. With the deficiency appropriation bill out of the way, so far as the House is concerned, I know of nothing important for next week that will come out of any committee.

Reference is made to labor legislation. Of course, the House cannot act until a committee reports. What the situation will be I am unable to state now, but I assume the House will be advised some time later in the week from a proper source. Perhaps the chairman of the committee will some time later in the week take the House into his confidence as to when he thinks his committee might report a bill out of the committee, if the committee does report a bill.

It is my personal desire, it is my personal hope, that the House will take a recess. Of course, there is no such thing as a permanent recess. I mean a recess of 3 days at a time.

Mr. MICHENER. Right along that line, nearly the whole morning has been taken up by 1-minute speeches in opposition to having any recess until something is done in connection with labor legislation introduced and now pending before committees. May I hope that the distinguished majority leader will confer with the members of the administration, especially with the leaders who appeared before the committees in opposition to any labor regulatory legislation, and see if something cannot be worked out that will help to assure the earliest possible successful conclusion of the war with the least cost in blood and treasure. The majority leader knows and I know there is no possibility of enacting legislation concerning labor as long as those charged with the war production program and the President take the position they do in reference to it. When the representatives of the President come before the committees and insist that this legislation would be detrimental to the war program, it places the House in a rather peculiar position.

The country should fully understand this situation. If the President will but indicate a willingness for legislation, the purpose of which is to eliminate strikes and provide for wartime working hours during the emergency, the Congress un-

doubtedly will act. Without that consent there is little prospect.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I wonder if the gentleman from Massachusetts does not agree with me that public opinion is such that this House could not take a recess prior to doing something with reference to the labor situation without giving grievous offense.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Georgia has his own opinion, and I thoroughly respect it, just as he said a moment ago he respects the opinions of others with whom he may disagree. I believe there are certain sections of the country—and I say this without going into the issues involved—that certainly have been given information about as incomplete and as inconsistent with the truth as I have ever heard. If the gentleman would talk about the country as a whole, I would give one answer to his question, but if he should ask me about certain sections of the country, my answer would be entirely different. In certain sections of the country the people have certainly been given an awful lot of misinformation.

Mr. COX. As to the communities where there is an abundance of evidence of an angry public opinion, I wonder if the gentleman would agree with me that that aroused and indignant public opinion is because of the trickling in of a little of the truth rather than the dissemination of false information.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is asking a hypothetical question.

Mr. COX. That is where we differ.

Mr. McCORMACK. For example, I think one of the most vicious things is to compare the man who is working with the man in the Army who is getting \$21 a month for the first 4 months. I served as a private in the Army and got \$30 a month. Certainly I did not think that because I got \$30 a month I should attack a man who was married, with a wife and children dependent upon him. Such a man has his responsibilities. He gets a much larger salary but he has to pay his rent, he has to pay for his clothing, his food and everything else, not only for himself but for his wife and children. I think that is an unfair if not an odious comparison, yet it is one that is sold to the country.

Mr. COX. Is not the responsibility that rests upon the married man or the man holding a lucrative job just as great as the responsibility on the boy who has been taken from school and sent into the Army?

Mr. McCORMACK. It happened that I had been a lawyer for 6 or 7 years when I enlisted as a private, but I certainly would not compare my financial situation as a private in the Army with the lawyer in private life who has to bear the responsibilities and the expenses of private life.

Mr. COX. Does not the greater responsibility rest upon the man who has the experience?

Mr. McCORMACK. Responsibility rests upon everyone; but the man in civil-

ian life certainly has greater financial burden and greater obligations than the man in the service.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, we are getting a long way away from the program about which I inquired.

[Here the gavel fell.]

REPUBLICAN RIVER COMPACT

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5945) to provide for granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska, with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5945) to provide for granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreements to the amendment of the Senate to the bill.

COMPTON I. WHITE,
JOHN R. MURDOCK,
DEWEY SHORT,
THOMAS WINTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

J. H. BANKHEAD,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
PAT MCCARRAN,
CHARLES L. McNARY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5945) granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The Senate amendment agreed with the House bill as passed insofar as the compact between the States was concerned, but did not conform to the last three sections of the bill which provided for the Federal Government to make proposals with respect to compacts between States. After full discussion, the managers on the part of the House came to a full agreement and receded from their position with respect to the three sections referred to and accepted the Senate amendment.

COMPTON I. WHITE,
JOHN R. MURDOCK,
DEWEY SHORT,
THOMAS WINTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the conference report?

Mr. WHITE. I may say for the benefit of the gentleman from Nebraska that the conference report is the result of an

agreement between the conferees of the House and the Senate. It is a report of the minority as well as the majority and was unanimously accepted by all concerned.

Mr. MICHENER. What does it do?

Mr. WHITE. It ratifies the compact that has been entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with regard to the use of the waters of the Republican River. It goes along with the ideas of the people from those States as expressed by their legislatures.

Mr. STEFAN. Those of us from Nebraska are very much interested in this matter as it affects the Republican River in Nebraska. How does this conference report affect the Republican River in Nebraska?

Mr. WHITE. The water that is covered by the compact is divided in accordance with the compact between the States.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. These compacts between States are sometimes of vital importance to the Nation; in fact, the compacts are so important that States cannot enter into those compacts with each other without the express consent of the Congress.

As I take it, this bill to which the gentleman refers provides for the entering into of a compact or agreement between certain States affecting some particular thing in which those particular States have a particular interest. Now, the House passed the bill permitting a compact. The matter went to the Senate and the Senate passed a bill permitting a compact, but there was some difference between the House and the Senate bills and the conferees have composed those differences. Now just what are the differences composed by the conferees?

Mr. WHITE. I think, if the gentleman will read the report, he will find out that the best interests of all the States through which the Republican River flows are safeguarded.

Mr. MICHENER. The conference report is not available.

Mr. WHITE. I think the gentleman will find that those things have been taken care of and that the rights of the several States have been fully protected.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has asked me to read the report, but the report is not available.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield to me, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. WHITE. I am yielding to the gentleman from the State of Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]. I may say that the Representatives from the States of Kansas and Nebraska and Colorado have been consulted. Lengthy hearings have been had on the bill, an agreement has been reached, and it has been approved by the Members from these particular States in the House. It has also been approved by the ranking Member on the gentleman's side of the House, and it is now entirely unanimous.

Mr. MICHENER. I may say to the gentleman from Idaho that since I inquired a second ago, I have been fur-

nished with the report which the gentleman from Idaho asked me to read. I have the report in my hand and it is about five or six lines long and simply says that the conferees have agreed. It does not say upon what you have agreed. I believe the House would like to have the distinguished gentleman from Idaho tell us about what the conferees have agreed upon.

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL of Colorado. I simply want to say that the Legislatures of Colorado, Nebraska, and Kansas agreed on the manner and method of dividing the water between the three States on this particular river, which is the Republican River. The Kansas Legislature, both the house and the senate, approved this compact. The Colorado Legislature, both the house and the senate, approved this compact. The Nebraska Legislature, both the house and the senate, approved this compact. Then it had to come back here to the Federal Government to have it approved here. Now what more do you want from the State of Michigan other than the fact that these three great States have agreed on the division of this water?

Mr. MICHENER. If I may be permitted to answer the gentleman, I may say that after the gentleman has been here some time and has gone over a lot of these compacts and understands the distribution of water in these Western States—and I do not come from that section myself—he will find that very often States upstream enter into compacts as to the distribution of water which is very agreeable to the States upstream, but to the lower riparian owners and the States downstream below those States the compacts might mean destruction to the lower States. This is the very purpose and reason that these matters must and should come before the Congress, and the facts should be explained to the Congress, other than simply to say that the two or three States that want to take the water out of a public stream and convert it to their own use should control even though they have agreed. I have not heard anything from the lower water users. Maybe they are satisfied, but I am speaking in their behalf.

Mr. WHITE. I will state to the gentleman from Michigan that I did not know that the water of the Republican River ran through the State of Michigan, and I will say further that all the States through which this river passes are in agreement and in accord and are parties to this compact.

Mr. MICHENER. If the gentleman does not have any more definite information than that about it, certainly this conference report should not be accepted.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Utah is a man who knows something about it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I think I can explain the matter in just a minute. This bill was heard by the Committee on Reclamation and Irrigation of the House,

was very carefully considered, and that committee thought certain amendments should be made to the compact which would explain the compact. Those amendments were proposed by the various departments, and when the bill was considered by the Senate, the Senate was opposed to these amendments and thought that the way the question should be handled would be to agree to the compact as it was entered into between the States, because if that was not done, then the compact would have to go back to the State legislatures.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes; I will yield, but I think I will come to the point the gentleman has in mind in just a minute.

There was a disagreement as to whether these amendments should be put in the bill or not. The House conferees have agreed with the Senate that the amendments are really not necessary and that the compact should be agreed to as it was passed by the three States. The three State legislatures have passed this compact and it is agreeable to all the people on the river and there is nothing with reference to it in dispute. Long hearings were had and the only thing in dispute and the only thing that the conferees were to decide upon was whether or not certain amendments that were proposed to the compact were necessary. The House conferees have concluded, after conference with the Senate, that these amendments are not necessary and should not be adopted, because if they were adopted the compact would have to go back to the respective State legislatures.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. And all of these States in any way affected by this basin are signatory States to this compact.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. And if they were not it would not bind any State that was not a party to it?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct, as I understand it.

Mr. CURTIS. And the fundamental purpose of this compact is to divide the water by volume for its use in the various States?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is also correct.

Mr. CURTIS. And no one raises objection to that?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No.

Mr. CURTIS. No Government department or agency?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Not so far as I am informed.

Mr. STEFAN. And it is perfectly agreeable to the State legislatures?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes. The only question involved was the question of nonnavigability, and the Department felt that it should be explained in the way the amendments provided.

Mr. CURTIS. And is it not also true that so far as this bill is concerned, it involves no authorization or appropri-

tion or contemplated Federal work of any kind?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. None whatever.

Mr. MICHENER. It is just one of the ordinary compacts?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. The thing that I am vitally interested in is this. Does this compact affect the lower basin?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. It does not, and the lower basins made no objection, after careful hearing. It was a unanimous vote in the Senate and a unanimous vote in the House, with the exception of these amendments, and the House concluded that it would be better not to amend it, due to the fact that it would have to go back to the State legislatures.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman is familiar with cases where States have entered into compacts as to the use of water, and such use prevented the water getting back into the streams.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes; I am.

Mr. MICHENER. And it is possible for some States to enter into compacts for the use of water, and thereby prevent any of that water from getting back into the stream and serving those below to any extent?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct, but every State interested in this is satisfied.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. And is it not a fact that no new precedent is established in reference to this compact?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct also.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO SPEAK FOR 1 MINUTE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has already had permission to speak for 1 minute today, has he not?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not recognize the gentleman to speak again the same day under the 1-minute program.

A CEILING ON WAGES

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the United States News has asked a number of Members whether we believed Congress should place a ceiling on wages to prevent inflation. This was my reply:

If we really intend to control prices and prevent inflation, of course, Congress will have to place a ceiling on wages as on other things.

How can you control the price of coal or lumber or cotton or steel or laundry if there is no ceiling on wages of any other product where labor is a large or even important item in cost?

It should be remembered, however, that when you fix a ceiling the fluctuation will be below that level, not at it and never above it. Only peak wages will ever touch it.

Your letter referred to farm prices held at approximately 110 percent of parity. That is a common but tragic delusion. A ceiling of 110 percent does not bring prices to that point. It stops them there. The fluctuation is all below that point. Farm prices will reach it, if ever, once or twice a year. They probably will not average plain parity; certainly they cannot if wages are free to soar.

The point should be remembered, however, in thinking of a ceiling for wages. Only peak wages, not average wages, will ever reach the ceiling.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications.

The Clerk read as follows:

MARCH 20, 1942.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation, effective March 20, 1942, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY SAUTHOFF.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is recognized.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEHEE] for the purpose of presenting a conference report.

CONSOLIDATING POLICE AND MUNICIPAL COURTS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McGEHEE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5784) to consolidate the police and municipal courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, for printing in the RECORD:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5784) to consolidate the Police Court of the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, to be known as "The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia", to create "The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia", and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That the Police Court of the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, be, and they are hereby,

consolidated into a single court to be known as "The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia."

THE MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"The court shall consist of ten judges appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, one of whom shall be designated by the President as chief judge.

"The terms of the judges shall be in accordance with the following schedule: The first two appointments shall be for a term of ten years each; the second two appointments shall be for a term of eight years each; and the remaining six appointments shall be for a term of six years each. The judges of the Police and Municipal Courts of the District of Columbia holding office on the effective date of this Act shall, however, serve as judges of The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia hereby created until the expiration of their respective commissions and until their successors are appointed and qualified.

"The Court shall adopt and have a seal, and shall be a court of record.

"Sec. 2. Subsequent appointments and reappointments to this court shall be for a term of ten years each. All judges shall continue in office until their successors shall be appointed and qualified. Each judge shall be subject to removal only in the manner and for the same causes as are now or hereafter provided for the removal of Federal judges. The salary of the chief judge shall be \$8,500 per annum and the salary of each associate judge shall be \$8,000 per annum. Each judge, when appointed, shall take the oath prescribed for judges of courts of the United States. No person other than a bona fide resident of the District of Columbia, and maintaining an actual place of abode therein for at least five years immediately prior to his appointment, or who shall have been a judge of one of the courts of the District of Columbia, shall be appointed a judge of The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia: *Provided, however*, That not more than two non-resident persons may be appointed and serve as judges of the said Municipal Court at any one time. Further, all appointees shall have been actively engaged in the practice of the law in the District of Columbia for a period of at least five years immediately prior to their appointment. Service during the present emergency in the armed forces of the United States shall be included in the computation of the five-year requirements herein specified.

"Sec. 3. (a) The chief judge shall, from time to time and for such period or periods as he may determine, designate the judges to preside and attend at the various branches and sessions of the court. He shall have the power to determine the number and fix the time of the various sessions of the court, to arrange the business of the court, and to divide it and assign it among the judges. He shall also be charged with the general administration and superintendence of the business of the court.

"(b) The chief judge shall give his attention to the discharge of the duties especially pertaining to his office, and to the performance of such additional judicial work as he may be able to perform.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the chief judge and the associate judges to meet together at least once in each month in each year, at such time as may be designated by the chief judge, for the consideration of such matters pertaining to the administration of justice in said court as may be brought before them.

"It shall be the duty of each associate judge to attend and serve at any branch or session of the court to which he is assigned. Each associate judge shall submit to the chief judge a monthly report in writing of the duties performed by him, which report shall specify the number of days attendance in court of such judge during said month, and

the branch courts upon which he has attended, and the number of hours per day of such attendance, and such other data as may be required by the chief judge, and in such form as the chief judge shall require.

"The chief judge shall submit to the Attorney General of the United States and to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia a quarterly report in writing of the business of the court and of the duties performed by each of the judges of the court during the preceding three months. A copy of said report shall be filed in the office of the clerk of the court and shall be available and subject to public inspection during business hours.

"In the event of the absence, disability, or disqualification of the chief judge, his duties shall devolve upon and be performed by the other judges in the order of seniority of their commissions.

"Each judge shall be entitled to vacation, which shall not exceed thirty-six court days in any one calendar year, and which shall be taken at such times as may be determined by the chief judge.

"The court shall have authority to appoint and remove a clerk of the court, whose salary shall be fixed by the court in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and the clerk so appointed shall have and exercise the powers and authority heretofore had or exercised by the clerk of the Police Court of the District of Columbia and the clerk of the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia.

"The clerk of the court shall have authority, subject to the approval of the chief judge, to appoint and remove such deputy clerks and such other employees as he may deem necessary, and to have their compensation fixed by the chief judge in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and shall have supervision and direction over them, except clerks serving the respective judges, who shall be appointed and removed from office by the respective judges, their compensation to be fixed by the respective judges in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

"The court shall have authority to appoint and remove a probation officer of the court, whose salary shall be fixed by the court in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and the probation officer so appointed shall have and exercise the powers and authority heretofore had or exercised by the probation officer of the Police Court of the District of Columbia.

"The probation officer of the court, subject to the approval of the chief judge, shall have authority to appoint and remove such assistant probation officers and such other employees of the probation office as he may deem necessary, and to have their compensation fixed by the chief judge in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and shall have supervision and direction over them.

"All officials and employees of the Police Court of the District of Columbia and of the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia holding office on the effective date of this Act shall continue in office unless and until they are removed therefrom; and all appropriations for the said Police Court or the said Municipal Court shall be available for the payment of the salaries and expenses of The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia as hereby established.

"Sec. 4. (a) The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, as established by this Act, shall consist of a criminal and a civil branch. The court and each judge thereof shall have and exercise the same powers and jurisdiction as were heretofore had or exercised by the Police Court of the District of Columbia or by the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia or the judges thereof on the effective date of this Act, and in addition

the said court shall have exclusive jurisdiction of civil actions, including counterclaims and crossclaims, in which the claimed value of personal property or the debt or damages claimed, exclusive of interest, attorneys' fees, protest fees, and costs, does not exceed the sum of \$3,000 and, in addition, shall also have exclusive jurisdiction of such actions against executors, administrators and other fiduciaries: *Provided, however*, That the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction of counterclaims and cross claims interposed in actions over which it has jurisdiction. The court shall also have jurisdiction over all cases properly pending in the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia or the Police Court of the District of Columbia on the effective date of this Act.

"(b) Service of process in the criminal division of the court shall be had as provided under existing law for the Police Court of the District of Columbia; service of process in the civil division of the court shall be had as provided under existing law for the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, or in such other manner as may be prescribed by rules of court.

"(c) All judgments entered by The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia on or after the effective date of this Act shall remain in force for six years and no longer unless the same be docketed in the office of the clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. Upon payment of a fee of 50 cents the clerk of The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia shall prepare a copy of any judgment of the said court whether heretofore rendered and in force and effective on the effective date of this Act or hereafter rendered, and the same upon being docketed with the clerk of said District Court shall have the same force and effect for all purposes as if it had been a judgment of said District Court. For the docketing of the same the clerk of said District Court shall charge a fee of 50 cents.

"Sec. 5. (a) If, in any action, other than an action for equitable relief, pending on the effective date of this Act or thereafter commenced in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, it shall appear to the satisfaction of the court at any pretrial hearing thereof that the action will not justify a judgment in excess of \$1,000, the court may certify such action to The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia for trial. The pleadings in such action, together with a copy of the docket entries and of any orders heretofore entered therein, shall be sent to the clerk of the said Municipal Court, together with the deposit for costs, and the case shall be called for trial in that court promptly thereafter; and shall thereafter be treated as though it had been filed originally in the said Municipal Court, except that the jurisdiction of that court shall extend to the amount claimed in such action, even though it exceed the sum of \$3,000.

"(b) The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia shall have the power and is hereby directed to prescribe, by rules, the forms of process, writs, pleadings and motions, and practice and procedure in such court, to provide for the efficient administration of justice, and the same shall conform as nearly as may be practicable to the forms, practice, and procedure now obtaining under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Said rules shall not abridge, enlarge, or modify the substantive rights of any litigant. After their effective date all laws in conflict therewith shall be of no further force or effect: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to require any change in the existing rules, procedure, or practice now in effect in the small claims and conciliation branch of the presently constituted Municipal Court of the District of Columbia; nor shall this Act or any section thereof in any way repeal or modify the provisions of

the Act of March 5, 1938 (52 Stat. 103, ch. 43), establishing said small claims and conciliation branch.

"(c) The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia shall have the power to compel the attendance of witnesses from any part of the District of Columbia by attachment, and any judge thereof shall have the power to punish for disobedience of any order, or contempt committed in the presence of the Court by a fine not exceeding \$50 or imprisonment not exceeding thirty days.

"THE MUNICIPAL COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"Sec. 6. There is hereby established and created an intermediate appellate court for the District of Columbia to be known as 'The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia' for the hearing of appeals from judgments and orders of The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia as established by this Act, and of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, as hereinafter provided.

"The court shall adopt and have a seal, and shall be a court of record.

"The said court shall consist of three judges appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, two of whom shall constitute a quorum, and one of whom shall be designated by the President as chief judge."

No person other than a bona fide resident of the District of Columbia and maintaining an actual place of abode therein for at least five years immediately prior to his appointment, or who shall have been a judge of one of the courts of the District of Columbia, shall be appointed a judge of The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Further, all appointees shall have been actively engaged in the practice of the law in the District of Columbia for a period of at least five years immediately prior to their appointment. Service during the present emergency in the armed forces of the United States shall be included in the computation of the five-year requirements herein specified.

"The chief judge shall be appointed for a term of ten years and the associate judges shall be appointed initially for terms of eight and six years each.

"Subsequent appointments and reappointments to this court shall be for a term of ten years each. All judges shall continue in office until their successors shall be appointed and qualified. Each judge shall be subject to removal only in the manner and for the same causes as are now or hereafter provided for the removal of Federal judges. The salary of the chief judge shall be \$9,500 per annum and that of each associate judge shall be \$9,000 per annum. Each judge, when appointed, shall take the oath prescribed for judges of courts of the United States. In the event of the absence, disability, or disqualification of any judge of The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of any such judge, the chief judge of said court may designate and assign any judge of The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia to act temporarily as a judge of said court. Likewise the chief judge, whenever he finds it in the public interest to do so, may designate and assign any judge of said Municipal Court of Appeals to act temporarily as a judge of The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia. In the event of the absence, disability, or disqualification of the chief judge of said court, his powers shall be exercised by that judge of said court next in seniority according to the date of commission.

"The said court shall appoint and remove a clerk who shall exercise the same powers and perform the same duties in regard to all matters within the jurisdiction of the court as are exercised and performed by the clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, so far as the same may be applicable, and his compensation shall be fixed by the court in accordance with the

Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The clerk of the court, subject to the approval of the chief judge, shall have authority to appoint and remove such deputy clerks and such other employees as he may deem necessary, and to have their compensation fixed by the chief judge in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and shall have supervision and direction over them, except clerks serving the respective judges, who shall be appointed and removed from office by the respective judges, their compensation to be fixed by the respective judges in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

"Sec. 7. (a) Any party aggrieved by any final order or judgment of The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, as created by this Act, or of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, may appeal therefrom as of right to The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Appeals may also be taken to said court as of right from all interlocutory orders of The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia whereby the possession of property is changed or affected such as orders dissolving writs of attachment and the like: *Provided, however*, That reviews of judgments of the small claims and conciliation branch of the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, and reviews of judgments in the criminal branch of the court where the penalty imposed is less than \$50, shall be by application for the allowance of an appeal, filed in said Municipal Court of Appeals. Said application shall be on a standard form, in simple language, prescribed by The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia. When the appealing party is not represented by counsel, it shall be the duty of the clerk to prepare the application in his behalf. The application for appeal shall be filed in The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia within three days from the date of judgment. It shall be promptly presented by the clerk to the chief judge and to each of the associate judges for their consideration. If they or any one of them are of the opinion that the appeal should be allowed, the appeal shall be recorded as granted, and the case set down for hearing on appeal, and given a preferred status on the calendar, and heard in the same manner as other appeals in said court. If the chief judge and both associate judges shall be of the opinion that an appeal should be denied, such denial shall stand as an affirmation of the judgment of the trial court, from which there shall be no further appeal.

"After the effective date of this Act, no writs of error or appeals, except in respect of judgments theretofore rendered, shall be granted by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to the said Municipal Court or to the said Juvenile Court.

"(b) The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall have the power to prescribe by rules what parts of the proceedings in the court below shall constitute the record on appeal, and to require that the original papers be sent to it instead of copies thereof, and generally to regulate all matters relating to appeals, whether in the court below or in said The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

"(c) The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall not require the record or briefs on appeal to be printed, and if they are printed, the cost of printing shall not be taxed as costs in the case. Said court shall review the record on appeal and shall affirm, reverse, or modify the order or judgment in accordance with law. If the issues of fact shall have been tried by jury, The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall review the case only as to matters of law. If the case shall have been tried without a jury, The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall have the power to review both as to the facts and the law, but in such case the

judgment of the trial court shall not be set aside except for errors of law or unless it appears that the judgment is plainly wrong or without evidence to support it.

"(d) This section shall not apply to any judgments rendered prior to the effective date of this Act.

"Sec. 8. Any party aggrieved by any judgment of The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia may seek a review thereof by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia by petition for the allowance of an appeal. The petition shall be in writing and shall be filed with the clerk of said United States Court of Appeals within ten days after the entry of such judgment, the contents of the petition to conform to the requirements which said United States Court of Appeals may by rule prescribe. Said Court of Appeals may prescribe rules governing the practice and procedure on such applications, the preparation of and the time for filing the transcript of the record in such cases, and generally to regulate all matters relating to appeals in such cases. If said Court of Appeals shall allow an appeal, the court shall review the record on appeal and shall affirm, reverse, or modify the order or judgment in accordance with law.

"Sec. 9. (a) The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall have the power and is hereby directed to prescribe, by rules, the forms of process, writs, pleadings and motions, and practice and procedure in such court, to provide for the efficient administration of justice, and the same shall conform as nearly as may be practicable to the forms, practice, and procedure now obtaining under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Said rules shall not abridge, enlarge, or modify the substantive rights of any litigant. After their effective date all laws in conflict therewith shall be of no further force or effect.

"Service of process shall be made by the United States Marshal for the District of Columbia.

"(b) The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, or any judge thereof, shall have the power to punish for disobedience of any order or contempt committed in the presence of the Court by a fine not exceeding \$50, or imprisonment not exceeding thirty days.

"Sec. 10. The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, and The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia as established by this Act, shall have full power and authority to censure, suspend, or expel from practice, at their respective bars, any attorney for any crime involving moral turpitude, or professional misconduct, or any conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice. Before any such attorney is censured, suspended, or expelled, written charges under oath against him must be presented to the court, stating distinctly the grounds of complaint. The court may order the charges to be filed in the office of the clerk of the court and shall fix a time for hearing thereon. Thereupon a certified copy of the charges and order shall be served upon the attorney personally by the marshal or such other person as the court may designate, or in case it is established to the satisfaction of the court that personal service cannot be had, a certified copy of such charges and order shall be served upon him by mail, publication, or otherwise, as the court may direct. At any time after the filing of said written charges, the court shall have the power, pending the trial thereof, to suspend from practice at its bar the person charged.

"Sec. 11. (a) Any judge of The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, any judge of The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, as established by this Act, or any judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, may hereafter retire after having served as a judge of such

court for a period or periods aggregating twenty years or more, whether continuously or not. Any judge who so retires shall receive annually in equal monthly installments, during the remainder of his life, a sum equal to such proportion of the salary received by such judge at the date of such retirement as the total of his aggregate years of service bears to the period of thirty years, the same to be paid in the same manner as the salary of such judge. In no event shall the sum received by any such judge hereunder be in excess of the salary of such judge at the date of such retirement. In computing the years of service under this section, service in either the Police Court of the District of Columbia or the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, or the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, as heretofore constituted, shall be included whether or not such service be continuous. The terms "retire" and "retirement" as used in this section shall mean and include retirement, resignation, or failure of reappointment upon the expiration of the term of office of an incumbent.

"(b) Any judge receiving retirement salary under the provisions of this Act may be called upon by the chief judge of The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia or the chief judge of The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to perform such judicial duties as may be requested of him in either of said courts, or in the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, but in any event no such retired judge shall be required to render such service for more than ninety days in any calendar year after such retirement. In case of illness or disability precluding the rendering of such service such retired judge shall be fully relieved of any such duty during such illness or disability.

"Sec. 12. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act, and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby; and if any provision hereof becomes inoperative, either by reason of failure of appropriations or otherwise, it shall not affect the legality or operative effect of any or all of the remaining features and provisions hereof.

"Sec. 13. The appropriations in the 1942 District of Columbia Appropriation Act, approved July 1, 1941, for the Police Court of the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, are hereby continued available for the purposes specified therein, and for the expenditures authorized by this Act. And there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia not otherwise appropriated, such funds as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"Sec. 14. The provisions of this Act authorizing the appointment and salaries of the judges of The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the clerk, deputy clerks, and other employees of said court, shall take effect one month after approval of this Act. The other provisions of this Act shall take effect three months after the date of its approval.

"The expression 'effective date of this Act', as used in this Act, means three months after the approval of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

DAN R. McGEHEE,

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,

OREN HARRIS,

Managers on the part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,

JOHN H. OVERTON,

HAROLD H. BURTON,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5784) to consolidate the police and municipal courts of the District of Columbia and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying report.

The House conferees agreed to Senate amendment to strike all of the language of the House bill and substitute in lieu thereof language of the Senate, with the exception of that which purported to determine an area, roughly described as a radius of 10 miles from the District of Columbia line, from which persons might be selected to serve as judges of the courts created by the bill. In lieu of that language, the conferees agreed that two non-resident persons may be selected to serve as judges of the Municipal Court, but not of the proposed Municipal Court of Appeals, provided those selected shall have been actively engaged in the practice of the law in the District of Columbia for a period of not less than 5 years immediately prior to appointment.

DAN R. McGEHEE,

O. HARRIS,

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5784) to consolidate the police and municipal courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The conferees of the House reached an agreement with the conferees of the Senate on last Friday. The House was not in session and not in a position to file the report under the rules of the House so that it could be taken up today. This being District of Columbia day, I think the matter should be disposed of.

I may say to the membership of the House that this bill was passed by the House unanimously 2 or 3 weeks ago. This conference report is a unanimous report from both Houses. The only material change made in the act as passed by the Congress was changing the title; also the bill as originally passed by the House contained a provision that those judges appointed to the municipal or police court of the District of Columbia should be residents of the District and shall have practiced law for a period of 5 years or more within the District. The amendment suggested by the Senate conferees is this, that there may be two judges appointed who may not live within the boundaries of the District of Columbia. That is, they may live in Chevy Chase, Md., or over the line in Virginia, but they must comply with the provisions of the act relative to the number of years that they shall have practiced law in the District of Columbia.

There is a further provision that in the event anyone appointed judge who shall enter the armed forces of the country during this emergency period shall not have that counted against him as not being a resident.

Another minor provision was that the House bill provided that the clerk of the court should be appointed by the presiding judge. The clerk then had authority to appoint all clerks and help under him. The Senate amended the House bill by

providing that the clerk should make the appointments by and with the advice and consent of the presiding judge, to which the conferees of the House agreed.

Those are the only amendments affecting the bill as passed by the House unanimously 2 or 3 weeks ago.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there are some important changes made in the bill. No notice has been given that the conference report was to be called up. Of course it is not necessary but is always advisable when possible. But certainly no one can object, inasmuch as this is District day and this is a District matter. Those especially interested in District matters are here present. I know of no reason why this is not the proper time to consider this particular conference report.

Mr. McGEHEE. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that there were some other changes, but it was merely transforming the language of the bill which I think more streamlines it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEHEE]?

There was no objection.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASSIGNMENT TO DETECTIVE FORCE OF THE METROPOLITAN POLICE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 6782) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to assign officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force to duty in the detective bureau of the Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes; and I ask unanimous consent that the same may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may assign to duty as assistant to the inspector commanding the detective bureau in the Metropolitan Police Department: any officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force and, during the period of such assignment, the said officer or member shall hold the rank and receive the pay of a captain of police and shall be eligible for assignment, by the said Commissioners, as chief of detectives. For the duration of such latter assignment such officer or member shall hold the rank and receive the pay of an assistant superintendent of police.

Sec. 2. That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia," approved May 27, 1924 (43 Stat. 174), is amended by striking therefrom (1) the colon following the phrase reading "Lieutenants, \$2,700 each" and (2) the proviso reading "Provided, That the lieutenant assigned as assistant to the inspector commanding the detective bureau shall, during the period of such assignment, hold the rank and receive the pay of a captain."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation, which is brought to the House from the Committee on the District of Columbia, is to authorize the Commissioners to assign any officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force to duty as assistant chief of detectives. That officer, for the duration of the assignment which had been made, would hold the rank and receive the pay of a captain, and be eligible for assignment as chief of detectives.

The bill simply expresses the intention of the committee and translates into legislation a worthy proposal. It makes it possible for the utilization of the services of such officers as the Commissioners believe best qualified for duty in the particular fields to which they may be assigned.

I may say to the membership there will be no additional expense involved if this bill becomes law. The Budget Bureau has given its approval to the measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE].

AMENDING THE ACT TO REGULATE BARBERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 5444) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PARMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to know whether on page 4 of the bill there is a provision requiring a religious test for keeping a barber shop open on another day than the accepted Sabbath?

Mr. SCHULTE. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] spoke to me about this the other day, and I explained it to him as well as I could.

The bill in its present form would authorize the Board of Barber Examiners to fix the opening and closing hours for all barber shops in the District on the basis of the preference of the majority of licensed barbers, and on the same basis to fix 1 day in 7 consecutive days on which all barber shops in the District shall remain closed.

I want to say that this bill was reported out of the committee unanimously.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that the question of religion does enter into this particular section of the bill.

Mr. SCHULTE. I may say to my good friend from Ohio that the gentleman who probably gave him that information

is the same fellow who appeared before this committee and has personally informed me that he was bitterly opposed to this and would continue to oppose it no matter what happened.

I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that the religious issue that has been brought into this thing by this particular individual is out of all proportion to the provisions of the bill. All the bill does is to say that if the barber belongs to a sect that has a Sabbath on some other than the accepted Sabbath, that all he need do is to appear before the Board and make that statement. Could anything be more clear-cut than that?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to permit the gentleman to tell me that I do not know my own mind about this proposition.

Mr. SCHULTE. The gentleman from Indiana is not trying to tell the gentleman from Ohio anything.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am merely saying that this raises a question of religion. What is the reason? Has any particular religious organization violated any particular law or indicated that it intends to violate the barber-shop law?

Mr. SCHULTE. Let me say to my good friend from Ohio that he will not get me into any religious argument at any time.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important bill. I have no objection at all to the consideration of the remainder of this bill, but I am going to object because this provision raises a religious question. I want the bill brought up so that it may receive proper consideration.

Mr. SCHULTE. The gentleman is not opposed to labor, is he?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Not at all, and this has nothing to do with labor or the rights of labor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 5444, to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and pending that I would like to arrive at an agreement as to time for general debate. Would 15 minutes a side be sufficient? I want the gentleman from Ohio to have an opportunity to air his views.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the time should be allotted in the regular way and that the ranking minority member of the committee should have control of time on the minority side.

Mr. SCHULTE. Would the gentleman be satisfied with 30 minutes equally divided between the majority and the minority?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That would be agreeable to the minority.

Mr. SCHULTE. I make that request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that debate on the bill be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by himself and the gentleman from Illinois. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just want to say I am opposed to the bill and want an opportunity to be heard very briefly.

Mr. SCHULTE. I will give the gentleman an opportunity to be heard. I shall be pleased to yield him part of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5444, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped to have time to explain an amendment which the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has suggested to this bill, which is fairly satisfactory to me, and I think it ought to be satisfactory to the House. I want to explain briefly the section involved in this bill to which I object.

It provides that the Board of Barber Examiners after they have ascertained the majority preference for the 1 particular closing day in the 7—

Mr. STEFAN. What section is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Page 4, beginning in line 8.

Excepting that any barber-shop proprietor of the District of Columbia may keep open his shop on the day voted by the majority to close, upon a proper showing duly made to the Board of Barber Examiners by the proprietor to the effect that the adopted closing day conflicts with the tenets of his religion and provided that his shop shall remain closed on the particular Sabbath of his religion.

The act provides that in the event such person may be aggrieved, he has the right to appeal through the courts for relief.

There is no reason why anyone having a different religious faith than I have, and I happen to be a Methodist, should have his religion dragged into a law of this sort. The amendment suggested by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and I think he will allow me to refer to his name in connection with it, removes the necessity of an aggrieved person involved appealing to a court for redress.

The persons who would be adversely affected want to obey the law, and if I know anything about the particular religions that are aimed at in this bill, the people belonging to them are regarded as very law abiding, the same as those belonging to other religions. My amendment provides:

Except that any barber-shop proprietor of the District of Columbia may keep his shop open on the day voted by the majority to close, provided he has closed his shop for 24 consecutive hours or 1 whole day of each week, the day beginning either at midnight or at sunset.

I have not talked the matter over with any of the parties involved in this controversy, but I think the amendment relieves the situation somewhat. It takes away from this measure a provision which I do not think belongs there. One of the most dangerous issues a legislative body can raise is that of religion.

It is not so much what may be involved in the particular phraseology of the bill under consideration. The question is what it may lead to hereafter. I think we could dispose of this whole controversy in very quick order if the gentleman from Indiana would see fit to agree to this amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee for the District of Columbia has shown to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] a proposed amendment which he has read to the House. Of course, I always attempt to cooperate fully with the committee of which I am the head, and when the committee voted to report this legislation to the floor without the amendment which I had suggested in the committee, I felt at that time that if there was a general disposition in the House to go ahead with the measure as presented I would not press the issue; however, when the gentleman from Ohio and others here allude to this problem of religious preference it brings me back to a certain responsibility on my own part in connection therewith. For that reason, at the proper time in the reading of the bill, it would be agreeable to me that the gentleman from Ohio offer the amendment.

May I say in explanation of my feelings on this matter that I belong to a faith, the Seventh Day Baptist Church, which would be affected by a closing on a certain day which we recognize as the Sabbath. I do not want to bring myself into the discussion personally, because I like to look at these matters objectively always. We have the orthodox Jew, we have the Seventh-day Adventist, we have the Seventh Day Baptist, and certain other faiths, some of them large in numbers, some of them, to be sure, only small numerically; but they feel deeply on this subject, and for that reason I feel that their case should be properly handled in a bill of this kind. I would suggest that during the reading of the bill the gentleman from Ohio, if in agreement with the amendment which I believe might solve the problem, if he cares to, offer the amendment, that the issue be resolved.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I thank the gentleman. I have just one more remark to make. Just because a Member of this House finds something in a measure pertaining to labor that he feels is not cor-

rect is no indication at all that that particular Member of the House is against labor.

I resent strongly the inference that simply because I happen to be interested in removing the religious test provided for barbers in the District of Columbia or anywhere else that I am opposed to labor. I am sincere in my opposition to this particular provision because I believe it violates the principle of religious liberty. I repeat that we must be very careful about raising religious questions of this kind, because they can lead to a great deal of damage.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. There are those of certain religious faiths who hold to the observance of the Sabbath as a day going from one sundown until another, and not from 12 o'clock to 12 o'clock, which is popularly considered to be the Sabbath.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment the gentleman from Ohio proposes to offer would sabotage the bill and wreck everything the barbers in the District of Columbia have gained for a number of years. If it is the gentleman's intention to wreck the betterment of conditions these men are trying to bring about, well the amendment he offers is the thing to do it; if he does not agree with them, then certainly I would rather withdraw the bill than accept his amendment, because the effect would be that it would just kill every piece of legislation and every help they would receive here. It would again allow them to go back to barbering 24 hours each day, 7 days a week.

This bill has been suggested by the majority of the barbers in the District of Columbia. Each and every one of them has gone over this bill very thoroughly. It has been sanctioned and endorsed by the people of the District of Columbia, and by practically every civic organization. They are very much in sympathy with it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is it not a fact that no barber in the District is objecting to the bill?

Mr. SCHULTE. The gentleman is correct. There is not a barber in the District of Columbia that has objected to this bill, not one.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman has made a very interesting statement. I am trying to find out about the bill. In what way does it affect the rest of the barbers if one barber shop wants to close on Saturday and remain open on Sunday, in accordance with the religious tenets of the owner? What does it do?

Mr. SCHULTE. There is one individual in the District of Columbia who gloats over the fact that he has wrecked

every barber bill that has been introduced, so that they can continue to work on Sunday. He has gloated over that fact. The religious angle is injected into this matter by this particular individual. He brought in the religious phase of it, saying that he wanted his people protected. The barbers in the District of Columbia, not wishing to offend anyone's feelings, suggested that merely by this particular individual's going before the Board of Barber Examiners and there saying that it conflicts with his religious tenets, he can keep open his shop on Sunday.

Mr. HINSHAW. But he closes on Saturday.

Mr. SCHULTE. He closes on the day of his Sabbath.

I may say that the majority of the committee—I would say 99 percent of them—were very much in sympathy with emphasizing the fact that these barbers could not keep open on Sunday, but to relieve the pressure on the mind of this one individual we have gone along to accept this and place it in the bill so it would protect one barber in the District of Columbia. We are sacrificing about 300 so 1 man will be appeased.

Mr. HINSHAW. Under this bill, as the gentleman has proposed it, as I understand, it is possible for this one man to go before the Board and obtain permission to remain open on Sunday?

Mr. SCHULTE. Yes; it is.

Mr. HINSHAW. Then what difference does it make whether he remains open on Sunday on his own volition or goes before a board and receives permission to do it?

Mr. SCHULTE. It is simply that we want him to go down there and be placed on record that he is of that particular religion. If that is not done, it will be just the same as in the case of any other law; you will have a lot of folks who will evade it. Everybody will be of that particular religion, not that they have ever gone to that church or worshiped there, but because this would allow them to use this as a method by which they could work 7 days a week.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. What would the gentleman say would be the answer in a case where five or six barbers in a shop were of a particular religious faith and did not observe the Sabbath as the first day of the week, but where the proprietor did observe Sunday? This bill would compel a showing that the proprietor's religion was such that he could not keep open on Sunday, and he would be unable to make that showing, but the religious faith of every barber in his shop might be such that they would not want to work on that day.

Mr. SCHULTE. I may say to my good friend that in the District of Columbia all the barbers have the same feeling about this bill that the majority of us have, that they do not want to keep open on Sunday.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Is not that just where this amendment is better for the bill?

Mr. SCHULTE. No; it is not. If the gentleman will read the amendment thoroughly, he will find that the amendment does nothing but place them right back where they are today, and they would just as soon have no bill at all.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Under what phraseology of the present law would this bill put the situation back where it was before?

Mr. SCHULTE. By virtue of the fact that men are going to evade the religious tendency part of it which I was just trying to explain. I do not see how anyone will be hurt. Does the gentleman object to going down and telling the particular board what religious faith he adheres to?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I object to any law that compels a person to prove his religion before he is allowed to work.

Mr. SCHULTE. I do not; so that is a difference of opinion. I am proud of my religion and proud of the fact that I have the pleasure of attending it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the gentleman feel that we could constitutionally enact a law that would compel a citizen to go before a governing body and prove his religious faith in order to gain a privilege or obtain a license to operate? Does this not amount to a religious test?

Mr. SCHULTE. I would say so, because our Government has always recognized one's religious faith, your Government and mine. We were the first to do that.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield to my good friend from Iowa.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Why is there so much circumlocution here in this bill on page 2, where the bill uses hundreds of words in order to designate the name of the first day of the week, meaning Sunday—a word of six letters? I am for the bill. I am for Sunday observance, but I do not understand why we must leave this thing to a vote of the barbers themselves when we all know that they are going to vote that the day when they will close their shops is the day we call Sunday. Let us write it that way.

Mr. SCHULTE. That is right.

Mr. GILCHRIST. That is positively true.

Mr. SCHULTE. Yes; that is right.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Then another thought with regard to the same thing is this: Do the barbers have a right to enact or vote a law? Why do we not ourselves enact the laws and say that the barber shops shall be closed on Sunday with an exception as proposed by the gentleman from Ohio that those who have a different religious idea about observing the Sabbath shall have the right to observe their Sabbath? What I am putting to the gentleman is this:

Why not write Sunday in this bill to start with?

Mr. SCHULTE. I grant the gentleman that and Sunday is the day I would close them if I were in charge of it. I want to say that no one, and this is the peculiar thing about it, outside of the gentleman from Ohio—not a barber in the District of Columbia, not a one of those who would be vitally affected, has objected to this bill, not one.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I am asking why we do not write in there the word "Sunday," and that will suit the barbers.

Mr. SCHULTE. Absolutely, it will, but it will not suit my friend from Ohio.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I think it would if we also put in a provision that those who have different scruples about Sunday and want to observe the seventh day can do so. That would suit the gentleman from Ohio, I believe.

Mr. SCHULTE. If they will go down and say they are of that particular religion, but they object to that.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I think that all the gentleman from Ohio wants to do is to protect such good people as the Seventh-day Adventists and others who believe in observing the seventh day of the week as their Sabbath.

Mr. SCHULTE. I want to say to my good friend that I want to protect them, too.

And I will be the first one to protect them, but I am not going to stand idly by and see them go around and circumvent this bill and bring back the same conditions that exist in the District of Columbia today, and that is what the gentleman's amendment will do.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, a member of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. If that amendment is adopted and a condition arises where there is a four-chair barber shop, then two of them can claim that they are of a certain faith and they want to observe their Sabbath on Saturday, and the other two can claim to be of an opposite faith, and then the other two will hold open the shop on Saturday and the two then can come back and keep the shop open on Sunday.

Mr. SCHULTE. That is it exactly.

Mr. RUSSELL. That will be the effect of the amendment should it pass.

Mr. SCHULTE. That is the reason I am opposing the gentleman's amendment. The gentleman says he is very much in sympathy with the men who work for a living, and I believe he is. Therefore, he should refuse to offer his amendment, and I am sure he would if he had seen the things we have seen and listened to the testimony of the men directly involved in this matter.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am for the gentleman's bill, especially for the barbers having 1 day of rest. I wish the gentleman would explain to me the effect of the language which states an exception as to any barber shop or pro-

prietor of a barber shop in the District who may keep open his shop except on the day voted by a majority to close the shop after making a proper showing. Suppose you had a Seventh-day Adventist or a man of the Hebrew faith who was the proprietor of the shop, and suppose he had 8 or 10 people who worked in the shop and wanted to observe Sunday and not the Sabbath. What becomes of those 7 or 8 people there working in the shop?

Mr. SCHULTE. They just do not work, I will say to my good friend.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. So then they have 2 days when they must be off.

Mr. SCHULTE. We have rewritten this bill several times to meet the objections of one individual. I do not believe a committee in Congress has ever gone so far to try to appease one individual. We have rewritten this bill several times at the suggestion of one gentleman, who will not work under its provisions, but simply is a pretended friend of the barbers.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman wants to accept this as it is so as to fix the responsibility of the man who tries to get out from under the law as it affects barbers?

Mr. SCHULTE. Yes; that is it; so that he cannot get away with that and not be fair and honest with men and take advantage of other barbers.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I want the barbers to have 1 day of rest.

Mr. SCHULTE. We all do.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Will the gentleman explain what the evil is that exists under the present law?

Mr. SCHULTE. We have a great many barber shops here that are open 24 hours of the day and 7 days in the week. We have barbers who work in one particular shop 8 hours and then go into another barber shop and work for 4 hours, and then we find some more who work 6 hours on Saturday and will go into a Sunday barber shop and work all day Sunday; and several members of the committee have voiced their opinion that they are very much opposed to the 24-hour barber shop.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. And they feel that a man is entitled to a day of rest.

Mr. SCHULTE. Several of the owners have taken advantage of these conditions and forced the men to work the 72 hours, and it is with that thought in mind that the barbers themselves—and I reemphasize that—are in favor of this bill 100 percent, and it is some outsider that is opposing it. Certainly the barbers themselves ought to be able to do what they want.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Is there any other profession or skilled workmen than the barbers who are permitted to fix the hours of work? In other words, if we pass this bill, we delegate to the barbers the right to fix the hours of work?

Mr. SCHULTE. Oh, no; we merely set up a board.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. But you provide for a questionnaire, and if a majority of the barbers vote to work 6 hours a

day, that is the law. Is that a condition that is peculiar only to barbers?

Mr. SCHULTE. In my State; yes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. In Washington?

Mr. SCHULTE. In Washington; no. Throughout the country in the various States this bill exists in a great many of them, and some of the bills go much further than this bill. Some of them emphasize the fact that they cannot be open on Sunday, but because of one individual who is not a barber, and who has no men under him who are barbers, but has openly stated that he has kept this bill from passing, we find him in the picture again.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have read the bill, but I want to ask specifically about one thing. I am in agreement with the committee in regard to the provision for 1 day's rest in 7, but of course there are various religious groups that have different views as to what that day should be. Is there a provision in this bill to take care of that matter?

Mr. SCHULTE. Let me say this relative to religion. All over the United States the Sunday has been accepted as the Sabbath, throughout the entire Nation, that is, all through the country except here. In a great many instances they do not work on Sundays, irrespective of what they profess. That is so in my State.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think we can better expedite the proper consideration of this bill and solve the problem the gentleman from Arizona raises, by proceeding with the reading of the bill and letting the amendments be offered. There is one amendment that will cover this subject.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

WIN WITH WORK—WORK AND WIN

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, win with work is the only way that the American people will ultimately be able to defeat our enemies and be victorious in the war we are now engaged in. That means everybody in America. We are on the spot, and the only way that we can hope to save our liberty, our independence, and the four freedoms is by giving our all to win the war.

I regret exceedingly that I must bring to the attention of the House of Representatives the case of Miss Genevieve Samp, an employee of the National Stamping Co., of Detroit. It so happened that Genevieve Samp, a 25-year-old American citizen and native of the State of Michigan, was employed by the National Stamping Co., of Detroit, on the production of metallic belt links for machine-gun ammunition, which is of critical importance to the armed forces of our country. It is very essential to offensive warfare, not only for our troops but for the aircraft armament. This young

lady, by her diligence, has earned the right to be considered by the company which employed her as one of their most desirable employees. But what has happened? Because of the fact that she tried to do more work in production—more than the average employee probably would or could do—and because of her zeal in trying to increase the amount of work she turned out, the unions, because of this increased production, stated that she was not in good standing and by the terms of the contract between the company and the C. I. O. union the company agrees to remove seniority from any employee upon written demand by the union which indicates that the union deems such employee to be not in good standing. Because of this language in the agreement, as interpreted by the union, it means in effect that the company must discharge an employee upon the demand of the union for any cause the union may trump up by the device of designating the individual to be not in good standing. Because the company was hesitant to discharge the subject employee without written demand by the union, and because the company did not deem a communication from the union to be in accordance with the union contract, the rank and file of the entire shift, about 300 in number, threatened to strike unless Miss Samp was discharged and removed from the plant.

Members of the House, is it not about time that America woke up? Is it not about time that the House of Representatives, the Senate of the United States, and the President of the United States woke up to the dangers confronting us? Because an employee tries to produce too much the unions demand that she be discharged. Let me say to the House of Representatives and to the country at large, Miss Genevieve Samp should be awarded a Distinguished Service Medal of some kind for the spirit she showed in trying to produce machine-gun belts and ammunition for the soldiers who are so badly in need of these implements of warfare. She ought to be lauded by the American people, especially by the labor unions, for trying to preserve our form of government and the four freedoms. But, gentlemen, instead of that, the labor unions demand that she be discharged, and the management had to fire her to prevent a strike. What are we coming to? Where are we headed? It is time that these radical labor leaders who make such demands be placed in concentration camps. The company would be glad to reemploy Miss Genevieve Samp, but they dare not do so because this would displease the unions and they would call a strike. It seems reasonable to think that one cause for Miss Samp's discharge was her willingness to comply with the request of the President of the United States to increase the productivity of men and machines because the President seemed to feel that this increased productivity was in the public interest in time of war. A further reason for her being thrown out of her job was that she did not choose to repudiate the pledge to the President of the United States made in her behalf by Philip Mur-

ray, who has assured and reassured the President, Mr. Donald Nelson, and the public that any lagging, any failure to utilize every talent or strength toward inevitable victory must be regarded as criminal.

I ask the House of Representatives to pass some laws that will make it a crime for anybody to create a slow-down in industry or for any reason to object to the American citizens furthering the interest of this country in winning this war, and I ask that these laws make it a crime against the country punishable by imprisonment or internment in a concentration camp for the duration.

Mr. Chairman, I have been further informed that there have been slow-downs over the week end at the Aluminum Co. of America plant in Cleveland, Ohio, and that some of the furnaces are operating at only 50 percent of capacity and others at 30 percent of capacity and some at 20 percent of capacity, these figures being based on production figures as of the 18th of this month. The unions take the attitude that there is no slow-down, and company officials point to the production and show that there is, and aluminum as we know is one of the principal items necessary for our airplanes and we ought to have 100-percent production every day. We find that on the 21st at the Aluminum Co. of America at Cleveland, 900 men were out of work due to lack of material for the sand foundry. It required the services of a colored man to go before the workers and plead with them for production, and finally to cause the men to speed up their operation. This man was Mr. Earl Burns, who showed his patriotism by doing what he did. Some of the men in this plant were trying to spoil the material and one of the employees pulled the thermocouple out because he wanted the furnace temperature to run higher. This results in inferior metal which would crack up in planes. After this thermocouple had been replaced, the same employee pulled it out again. A man like this should be put behind bars.

It seems to me we need to take action, and do so at once, to govern radicalism in our country if we do not lose our form of government. Will the Congress act? Let us hope they do and do it before it is too late.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the bill for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the entire bill be considered as read, and any portion thereof may be open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Barbers' Opening and Closing Hours of 1941."

SEC. 2. That the following provisions and regulations of this act are declared to be enacted in the interest of the public health, public safety, and general welfare of the people of the District of Columbia, and that by legislative determination the profession of barbering and the operation of barber

shops are hereby declared to be affected with a public interest.

Sec. 3. The Board of Barber Examiners for the District of Columbia shall have the power to submit to each licensed barber of the District of Columbia a questionnaire providing for the licensed barber to state his preference as to the opening and closing hours for barber shops in the District of Columbia. That the Board of Barber Examiners shall be empowered to require a reasonable time, within which each licensed barber of the District of Columbia shall complete and return the questionnaire to the Board of Barber Examiners. That the Board of Barber Examiners shall inspect all the completed questionnaires on the next day after the time limit for their return has expired, and that the Board of Barber Examiners shall ascertain from the completed questionnaires which opening and closing hours for barber shops are preferred by the majority of licensed barbers of the District of Columbia. That the opening and closing hours for barber shops preferred by the majority of licensed barbers of the District of Columbia, as disclosed by the completed questionnaires, shall be adopted by the Board of Barber Examiners for all barber shops of the District of Columbia, and that the adopted opening and closing hours shall become effective for all barber shops in the District of Columbia 30 days after the date on which the Board of Barber Examiners ascertained the majority preference for opening and closing hours. That immediately after ascertaining the majority preference for opening and closing hours, the Board of Barber Examiners shall post a public notice in its offices concerning its findings on the majority preference for opening and closing hours, and shall cause to have published in two District of Columbia newspapers its findings on the majority preference for opening and closing hours.

Sec. 4. That the Board of Barber Examiners for the District of Columbia shall have the power to submit to each licensed barber of the District of Columbia a questionnaire providing for the licensed barber to state his preference as to the 1 day in 7 on which barber shops of the District of Columbia should remain closed. That the Board of Barber Examiners shall be empowered to require a reasonable time within which each licensed barber of the District of Columbia shall complete and return the questionnaire to the Board of Barber Examiners. That the Board of Barber Examiners shall inspect all the completed questionnaires on the next day after the time for their return has expired, and that the Board of Barber Examiners shall ascertain from the completed questionnaires the 1 day in 7 on which the majority of the licensed barbers of the District of Columbia prefer to have barber shops of the District of Columbia remain closed. That the closing day preferred by the majority of licensed barbers of the District of Columbia, as disclosed by the completed questionnaires, shall be adopted by the Board of Barber Examiners for all barber shops of the District of Columbia, and that the adopted closing day shall become effective for all barber shops in the District of Columbia 30 days after the date on which the Board of Barber Examiners ascertained the majority preference for the 1 particular closing day in 7, excepting that any barber shop proprietor of the District of Columbia may keep open his shop on the day voted by the majority to close upon a proper showing duly made to the Board of Barber Examiners by the proprietor to the effect that the adopted closing day conflicts with the tenets of his religion, and, provided, that his shop shall remain closed on the particular Sabbath of his religion.

Sec. 5. The Board of Barber Examiners shall adopt and enforce all rules and orders necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. All rules and orders of the Board of Barber Examiners, under the provisions of this act,

shall be printed and posted for public view in the offices of the Board.

Sec. 6. When the uniform opening and closing hours for all barber shops of the District of Columbia have been approved and adopted by the Board under the provisions of this act, and have become effective, it shall be unlawful for the owner of any barber shop or for any agent or employee of such owner to permit such barber shop to be open for the business of barbering for revenue, pay, free, or otherwise, outside of the opening and closing hours adopted by the Board for all barber shops. It shall likewise be unlawful for the owner of any barber shop or for any agent or employee to permit such barber shop to be open for the business of barbering for revenue, pay, free, or otherwise, on the day of the week which the Board of Barber Examiners has adopted under the provisions of this act as the one on which all barber shops shall be closed, subject to the exception provided in section 4 of this act.

Sec. 7. The Board of Barber Examiners, upon due notice and opportunity of hearing to the licensee, may suspend or revoke any barber's license when the Board is satisfied that the holder of such license has violated any provision of this act. Any licensee who considers himself aggrieved by an action of the Board suspending or revoking his license may, within 30 days after receipt of the order of the Board, take an appeal from the action of the Board to the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, which court shall have jurisdiction to reverse, vacate, or modify the order complained of, if, after hearing, such court is of the opinion that such order was unlawful or unreasonable. Upon service of notice of such appeal, the Board shall, with its answer, file a transcript of testimony taken during the hearing before the Board, and the original papers, or duly authenticated transcripts thereof. No proceedings to vacate, reverse, or modify a final order rendered by the Board shall operate to stay the execution or effect thereof, unless the court, on application, and 3 days' notice to the Board, shall allow such stay.

Sec. 8. If any clause, sentence, paragraph, or part of this act or any rule of the Board adopted pursuant to it shall for any reason be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder thereof, but shall be limited in its operation to the clause, sentence, paragraph, or part thereof directly involved in the controversy in which the judgment shall have been rendered.

Sec. 9. That all expenses incidental to the administration of this act shall be paid from the funds of the Board of Barber Examiners in the manner and form governing other expenditures of that Board.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 4, line 8, after the comma, following the word "seven", strike out down to and including all of line 14 and insert the following in lieu thereof: "excepting that any barber-shop proprietor of the District of Columbia may keep his shop open on the day voted by the majority to close, provided he has closed his shop for 24 consecutive hours or 1 whole day of each week, the day beginning either at midnight or at sunset."

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have already explained the import of this amendment. It is not as satisfactory as I would like to have it. I am sorry matters of this kind have to be raised here at all. Making religion a test for anything, I repeat, is very dangerous. If you trace the history of the persecution

of certain groups in Europe you will find it goes back to their religion. Religious persecution led to confiscation of property and many things worse than that.

It is not because I fear this particular provision in the act so much that I object to it. It is fear of what these things may lead to that concerns me. Because if you can raise a religious test in a case of this kind, certainly you can raise it in many others.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I believe that when an individual is called on to go into the courts or before a board and prove the tenets of his religion as it affects legislation under which he operates his business, as the gentleman well says, we are going into a field which holds dangerous implications for the exercise of religious liberty in America.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. There is no question about that at all.

This amendment which I am offering, as I stated, is not as satisfactory as I would like to have it. I do not want to injure the gentleman's bill. I think he is mistaken when he says that this will in effect destroy the entire proposed act. I do not believe that at all.

The gentleman has made the statement that there is only one individual in the entire District of Columbia who is involved in this provision. Am I correct in that statement? Is that the statement that the gentleman made, that there is only one person in the District of Columbia who is involved?

Mr. SCHULTE. As chairman of the subcommittee which held hearings on this bill, I will state there was only one person who appeared in opposition to it; one individual who has consistently and repeatedly opposed any and all legislation that would help the barbers.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I, perhaps, misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is absolutely immaterial to me whether one man or a hundred million men oppose a proposition if my individual right is being trod upon—a right guaranteed to me by the Constitution. I have a right to oppose that so long as I live. My duty is to hand that right, as an inalienable right, down to my offspring. To me that is very fundamental.

I would like to submit this question: As the gentleman understands this bill, is it designed in such a way that it will prohibit a barber from closing his shop all day long any day he pleases?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. No. I would not go that far; but I will say this, the power is in the hands of the Board. It depends on what it does in the matter. It can act arbitrarily and so can do that very thing. To be sure, the person aggrieved can go to the courts and there seek redress.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not interested in going into court. I do not like the

courts. I have never been in court on a case of my own in my life, and I do not intend to go there if I can keep out. I have not studied this bill. Is this bill designed in such way that the Board can tell me when I must close my shop and when I cannot keep my shop open?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman from West Virginia can, perhaps, explain that better than I can.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the question is very pertinent because it goes to the whole body of the bill. I think the religious matter for the moment can be set aside, because I am in complete agreement with the gentleman from Michigan. Under the provisions of the bill as brought to the House, the Board itself would not have the power that the gentleman suggests, of arbitrarily closing for a certain day or a certain number of hours, but the barbers themselves, by a vote of their own membership, would decide those questions.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is the bill designed in such a way that a group of barbers, by a majority vote, can say to me, "You must close your shop on a certain day and you must keep it open every other day of the week"?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Precisely so, on the basis of a religious test.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now, suppose something happened in my family that I could not possibly get down to operate my one-chair barber shop, what are you going to do in a situation like that?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the point which the gentleman from Michigan raised is the important one. It is not a matter of how many people are involved, but one of principle; that is what we are concerned with here. There is not, as I stated, anything in this amendment that can in the main be objected to. It does relieve in a large measure the religious test in order to operate or not to operate a barber shop on a particular day. I submit my amendment is fair and should be adopted.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, again I say that what the gentleman has said is certainly something that we do not agree with for a minute. If this amendment is adopted we are right back to where we started and there will be 24-hours-a-day barber shops.

I think we have had enough discussion of the matter on both sides, so I am going to ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt the Committee divided and there were—ayes 24, noes 19.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently there is not a quorum present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 45]

Baldwin	Hart	Osmers
Barry	Holbrook	O'Toole
Beam	Hook	Peterson, Fla.
Bender	Houston	Pfeifer,
Bishop	Jarrett	Joseph L.
Boehne	Johnson,	Plauché
Boggs	Lyndon B.	Ramsay
Boiton	Kee	Rivers
Bradley, Pa.	Keefe	Romjue
Buck	Kelley, Pa.	Sacks
Buckler, Minn.	Kelly, Ill.	Sanders
Buckley, N. Y.	Kennedy,	Satterfield
Eyrne	Michael J.	Scanlon
Byron	Keogh	Schaefer, Ill.
Cannon, Fla.	Kleberg	Scott
Capozzoli	Klein	Scrugham
Chapman	Kociaikowski	Shannon
Cole, Md.	Kopplemann	Sheridan
Courtney	Kramer	Short
Crowther	Lesinski	Smith, Pa.
Cullen	Lewis	Smith, Wis.
Dickstein	Lynch	Somers, N. Y.
Dies	McGranery	Stratton
Dingell	McKeough	Sweeney
Ditter	McMillan	Thomas, N. J.
Eliot, Mass.	Maclejewski	To'an
Fitzpatrick	Maciora	Vreeland
Fulmer	Magnuson	Wadsworth
Gale	Marcantonio	Walter
Gamble	Martin, Mass.	West
Gavagan	Merritt	Wheat
Gerlach	Mitchell	Wigglesworth
Gifford	Myers, Pa.	Woodrum, Va.
Gillette	O'Day	Worley
	O'Hara	Wright

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5444) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 330 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the parliamentary situation?

The CHAIRMAN. The vote is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is the vote taken over again?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may again be read for the information of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were—ayes 65, noes 53.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. SCHULTE and Mr. SMITH of Ohio to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 77, noes 59.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. PATMAN having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5444) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question will be ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were—ayes 68, noes 32.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 117, nays 170, not voting 144, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]
YEAS—117

Andersen.	Culkin	Hill, Colo.
H. Carl	Curtis	Hinshaw
Andresen.	Dewey	Hoffman
August H.	Dirksen	Holmes
Andrews	Dondro	Hope
Arends	Douglas	Hull
Barden	Dworshak	Jenkins, Ohio
Baumhart	Eberharter	Jennings
Bennett	Edmiston	Johns
Blackney	Elliott, Calif.	Johnson, Ill.
Boren	Elston	Johnson, Ind.
Bradley, Mich.	Engel	Johnson, Okla.
Brown, Ohio	Fellows	Jones
Carlson	Fish	Jonkman
Cartwright	Ford, Leland M.	Kefauver
Case, S. Dak.	Ford, Thomas F.	Kilburn
Chenoweth	Gearhart	Knutson
Chilperfield	Gore	Kunkel
Clason	Grant, Ind.	Lambertson
Clevenger	Guyer	Landis
Cluett	Hall	Lea
Costello	Edwin Arthur	McGehee
Cox	Hall	McGregor
Cravens	Leonard W.	Mahon
Crawford	Halleck	Mason
Crowther	Hancock	May

Michener
Moser
Mott
Mundt
Murdock
Murray
Nelson
O'Brien, N. Y.
Paddock
Pheffer,
William T.
Pittenger
Pioeser
Plumley
Priest

NAYS—170

Allen, La.
Anderson,
N. Mex.
Angell
Arnold
Barnes
Bates, Ky.
Beckworth
Bell
Boggs
Boland
Bonner
Boykin
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buck
Bulwinkle
Burdick
Burgin
Butler
Camp
Canfield
Cannon, Mo.
Casey, Mass.
Chapman
Cochran
Coffee, Nebr.
Coffee, Wash.
Collins
Colmer
Cooley
Cooper
Copeland
Creal
Cresser
Cunningham
D'Alesandro
Davis, Ohio
Day
Delaney
Disney
Domengeaux
Doughton
Downs
Drewry
Duncan
Eaton
Ellis
Englebright
Flannagan
Fogarty
Folger
Forand
Ford, Miss.
Gathings
Gehrmann
Gibson

NOT VOTING—144

Allen, Ill.
Anderson, Calif.
Baldwin
Barry
Bates, Mass.
Beam
Belter
Bender
Bishop
Bland
Bloom
Boehne
Bolton
Bradley, Pa.
Buckley, Minn.
Buckley, N. Y.
Burch
Byrne
Byron
Cannon, Fla.
Capozzoli
Carter
Celler
Clark
Claypool
Cole, Md.
Cole, N. Y.
Courtney

NAYS—170

Smith, Ohio
Smith, Va.
Stearns, N. H.
Sumner, Ill.
Talbot
Tibbott
Tinkham
Vorys, Ohio
Wilson
Wolcott
Wolfenden, Pa.
Young
Youngdahl
Zimmerman

NAYS—170

Pearson
Peterson, Ga.
Poage
Powers
Rabaut
Ramspeck
Rankin, Miss.
Rankin, Mont.
Reece, Tenn.
Richards
Robertson,
N. Dak.
Robertson, Va.
Robinson, Utah
Robison, Ky.
Russell
Sabath
Sasser
Sauthoff
Schuetz
Schulte
Shanley
Sheppard
Smith, Wash.
Smith, W. Va.
Smith, Wis.
South
Sparkman
Spence
Springer
Sarnes, Ala.
Stefan
Stevenson
Sullivan
Taber
Talle
Tarver
Tenerowicz
Terry
Thill
Thom
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Trajnor
Van Zandt
Vincent, Ky.
Voorhis, Calif.
Ward
Wasielewski
Weaver
Welch
Whichel
Whitten
Whittington
Wickersham
Williams
Wolverton, N. J.

NAYS—170

Howell
Izac
Jacobsen
Jarrett
Jenks, N. H.
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson,
Lyndon B.
Johnson, W. Va.
Kee
Keefe
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, Ill.
Kennedy,
Martin J.
Kennedy,
Michael J.
Keogh
Kilday
Kinzer
Kleberg
Klein
Kocalkowski
Kopplemann
Kramer
Lesinski
Lewis
Ludlow

Lynch
McGranery
McKeough
McMillan
Maas
Maclejewski
Maciora
Marcantonio
Magnuson
Martin, Mass.
Merritt
Mitchell
Myers, Pa.
O'Connor
O'Day
O'Hara
Osmers
O'Toole
Peterson, Fla.
Pfeifer
Joseph L.
Pierce

Plauché
Ramsay
Rivers
Rolph
Romjue
Sacks
Sanders
Satterfield
Scanhon
Schaefer, Ill.
Scott
Scrugham
Shannon
Sheridan
Short
Sikes
Smith, Pa.
Snyder
Somers, N. Y.
Steagall
Stratton
Sumners, Tex.

Sutphin
Sweeney
Thomas, N. J.
Tolan
Treadway
Vinson, Ga.
Vreeland
Wadsworth
Walter
Weiss
Wene
West
Wheat
White
Wigglesworth
Winter
Woodruff, Mich.
Woodrum, Va.
Worley
Wright

So the amendment was rejected.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Baldwin.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Rolph.
Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Courtney with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Kinzer.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Boehne with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Plauché with Mr. Bishop.
Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.
Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Vreeland.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Short.
Mr. Beam with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Hook with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Johnson of California.
Mr. Johnson of West Virginia with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Pierce with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Belter with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
Mr. McKeough with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Kocalkowski with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
Mr. Kilday with Mr. Gale.
Mr. Lewis with Mr. Wheat.
Mr. Kopplemann with Mr. Jarrett.
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Heidinger.
Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Ludlow with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Maclejewski with Mr. Gerlach.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Howell.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Haines with Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer.
Mr. Ramsay with Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Elliot of Massachusetts.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Fitzgerald.
Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Merritt.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Flaherty.
Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania with Mr. Mitchell.
Mr. Dies with Mr. McGranery.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Magnuson.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Somers of New York.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Tolan.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Snyder.

Mr. Kramer with Mr. Sutphin.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Weiss.
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Wene with Mr. Sikes.
Mr. West with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. White.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Sacks.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Jacobsen.
Mr. Houston with Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Sanders with Mr. Heffernan.
Mr. Maciora with Mr. Wright.
Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Faddis.
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mrs. Byron.
Mr. Claypool with Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson.
Mr. Scanlon with Mr. Worley.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 114, noes 33.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 222, nays 42, answered "present" 2, not voting 165, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

YEAS—222

Allen, La.	Coffee, Nebr.	Gibson
Anderson,	Coffee, Wash.	Gilchrist
N. Mex.	Colmer	Gillie
Andreen,	Cooley	Gore
August H.	Cooper	Gossett
Andrews	Copeland	Graham
Angell	Cravens	Granger
Arends	Crosser	Grant, Ind.
Arnold	Crowther	Green
Barden	Culkin	Gregory
Barnes	Cunningham	Gwynne
Bates, Ky.	D'Alesandro	Hall
Baumhart	Davis, Ohio	Edwin Arthur
Beckworth	Davis, Tenn.	Halleck
Bell	Day	Harness
Backney	Delaney	Harrington
Boggs	Dewey	Harris, Ark.
Boland	Dirksen	Harris, Va.
Borner	Domengeaux	Harter
Boykin	Dondero	Hendricks
Bradley, Mich.	Douglas	Hill, Wash.
Brooks	Downs	Holbrook
Brown, Ga.	Duncan	Holmes
Brown, Ohio	Dworshak	Hope
Bryson	Eberharter	Hull
Burdick	Edmiston	Hunter
Burgin	Elliott, Calif.	Imhoff
Butler	Ellis	Jackson
Camp	Elston	Jarman
Canfield	Engel	Jenkins, Ohio
Cannon, Mo.	Englebright	Jennings
Cartwright	Fellows	Johns
Case, S. Dak.	Fogarty	Johnson, Ill.
Casey, Mass.	Folger	Johnson, Ind.
Chapfield	Forand	Johnson,
Clason	Ford, Thomas F.	Luther A.
Clevenger	Gathings	Jones
Cochran	Gehrmann	Jonkman

Kean	Oliver	Smith, Wash.
Kefauver	O'Neal	Smith, W. Va.
Kirwan	Paddock	Smith, Wis.
Knutson	Patman	South
Kunkel	Patrick	Sparkman
Landis	Patton	Spence
Lane	Pearson	Springer
Lanham	Pfeiffer	Stearns, N. H.
Lea	William T.	Stefan
Leavy	Pierce	Stevenson
LeCompte	Pittenger	Sullivan
McGregor	Priest	Sumner, Ill.
McIntyre	Rabaut	Talbot
McLaughlin	Ramspeck	Talle
McLean	Rankin, Miss.	Tarver
MacIara	Rankin, Mont.	Tenerowicz
Mahon	Reece, Tenn.	Terry
Manasco	Reed, Ill.	Thill
Mansfield	Rees, Kans.	Thom
Martin, Iowa	Robertson	Thomas, Tex.
Mason	N. Dak.	Thomason
May	Robertson, Va.	Tibbott
Meyer, Md.	Robinson, Utah	Tinkham
Michener	Robison, Ky.	Traynor
Mills, Ark.	Rockefeller	Van Zandt
Mills, La.	Rockwell	Voorhis, Calif.
Monroney	Rodgers, Pa.	Ward
Moser	Rogers, Mass.	Wasielewski
Mundt	Rogers, Okla.	Weaver
Murdock	Rolph	Weich
Murray	Russell	Welch
Nelson	Sasser	Whitell
Norrell	Sauthoff	Whittington
Norton	Schulte	Wickersham
O'Brien, Mich.	Secrest	Williams
O'Brien, N. Y.	Shanley	Wilson
O'Connor	Sikes	Wolverton, N. J.
O'Leary	Smith, Maine	Young

NAYS—42

Andersen, H. Carl	Guyer	Plumley
Bennett	Hall	Rich
Boren	Leonard W.	Rizley
Chenoweth	Hancock	Shaffer, Mich.
Costello	Hill, Colo.	Sheppard
Cox	Hobbs	Smith, Ohio
Crawford	Hoffman	Smith, Va.
Curtis	Jensen	Starnes, Ala.
Drewry	Johnson, Calif.	Taber
Eaton	Kilburn	Vincent, Ky.
Ford, Leland M.	Lambertson	Vorys, Ohio
Ford, Miss.	Larrabee	Wolcott
Gearhart	Mott	Wolfenden, Pa.
Grant, Ala.	Peterson, Ga.	Youngdahl
	Ploeser	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Chapman	Randolph
---------	----------

NOT VOTING—165

Allen, Ill.	Faddis	Kerr
Anderson, Calif.	Fenton	Kilday
Baldwin	Fish	Kinzer
Barry	Fitzgerald	Kleberg
Bates, Mass.	Fitzpatrick	Klein
Beam	Flaherty	Kociskowski
Beiter	Flannagan	Koppelman
Bender	Fulmer	Kramer
Bishop	Gale	Lesinski
Bland	Gamble	Lewis
Bloom	Gavagan	Ludlow
Boehne	Gerlach	Lynch
Bolton	Gifford	McCormack
Bradley, Pa.	Gillette	McGehee
Buck	Haines	McGranery
Buckler, Minn.	Hare	McKeough
Buckley, N. Y.	Hart	McMillan
Bulwinkle	Hartley	Maas
Burch	Healey	Maclejewski
Byrne	Hébert	Magnuson
Byron	Heffernan	Marcantonio
Cannon Fla.	Heldinger	Martin, Mass.
Capozzoli	Hess	Merritt
Carlson	Hinshaw	Mitchell
Carter	Hook	Myers, Pa.
Celler	Houston	Nichols
Clark	Howell	O'Day
Claypool	Izac	O'Hara
Cluett	Jacobsen	Osmer
Cole, Md.	Jarrett	O'Toole
Cole, N. Y.	Jenks, N. H.	Face
Collins	Johnson	Peterson, Fla.
Courtney	Lyndon B.	Pfeifer
Creal	Johnson, Okla.	Joseph L.
Cullen	Johnson, W. Va.	Plauché
Dickstein	Kee	Poage
Dies	Keefe	Powers
Dingell	Kelley, Pa.	Ramsay
Disney	Kelly, Ill.	Reed, N. Y.
Ditter	Kennedy	Richards
Doughton	Martin J.	Rivers
Durham	Kennedy	Romjue
Eliot, Mass	Michael J.	Sabath
	Keogh	Sacks

Sanders	Somers, N. Y.	Weiss
Satterfield	Steagall	Wene
Scanlon	Stratton	West
Schaefer, Ill.	Summers, Tex.	Wheat
Schuetz	Sutphin	White
Scott	Sweeney	Wigglesworth
Scruggam	Thomas, N. J.	Winter
Shannon	Tolan	Woodruff, Mich.
Sheridan	Treadway	Woodrum, Va.
Short	Vinson, Ga.	Worley
Simpson	Vreeland	Wright
Smith, Pa.	Wadsworth	Zimmerman
Snyder	Walzer	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Creal with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Doughton with Mr. Carlson.
Mr. Hare with Mr. Simpson.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Cluett.
Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Sabath.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Schuetz.
Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Zimmerman.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Healey.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Buck.
Mr. Collins with Mr. Poage.
Mr. Summers of Texas with Mr. Disney.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Wright.
Mr. Ramsay with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Shannon with Mr. Wadsworth.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALARIES OF METROPOLITAN POLICE AND OTHERS

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6336) to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to conform with the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia, and also to conform with wages paid in many cities of the Nation, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I must object to that request.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6336); and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 20 minutes to be equally divided between the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6336, with Mr. HOBBS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill pending provides for increases in the pay of policemen and firemen below the rank of captain in the District of Columbia. It involves a total of about \$776,000.

Let me give you five reasons why this bill should be defeated. The first reason is that Commissioner Russell Young, of the Board of District Commissioners, who is directly responsible for the police and fire departments, is opposed to the bill, and stated in the hearings before the subcommittee that "Frankly and bluntly, we cannot afford it."

The second reason is that they come for promotions aggregating about three-quarters of a million dollars at a time when thrift and economy is demanded by the country and also by the residents of the District of Columbia. Let me point out to you that the increase here directly for the police department will be \$393,020. Now, in addition to that, you must add \$117,000, for after you have increased the salaries the proportion for retirement upkeep out of the District treasury, of which the District pays more than 82 percent, will, after the first of the year, aggregate \$117,000 a year. In addition to this, there are some White House policemen who share in the benefits to the extent of \$18,000, according to the Auditor of the District of Columbia. Finally, there is a \$140 per year promotional set-up in the bill, which will account for another \$111,000. So the total amount involved is about three-quarters of a million dollars, directly and indirectly. And I submit to you, as a second reason, because of the cost that is involved at this time, the bill should not pass.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Briefly.

Mr. STEFAN. I wonder if the gentleman would not agree with me that, in view of the fact that the District of Columbia appropriation bill is going to be reviewed by our committee, perhaps early in May, and there has been some suggestion that it is outmoded and we ought to go all over the budget again, this bill should be deferred until we take up the appropriation bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. What is the scale of pay of the policemen and firemen?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The scale is set out in the bill itself, H. R. 6336. I have not tried to keep all the scales in mind. That brings me to the third reason as to whether or not this increase is necessary at this time.

I recognize that living cost goes up in the District of Columbia as it goes up

elsewhere, but the fact is that these cannot be such ill-paid jobs for otherwise you would not have a long list of applicants trying to get on the police force of the District of Columbia. The fourth reason is that once you start a promotional increase for the police and firemen in the District of Columbia you are setting a precedent, and others will be here for increases in pay of one kind and another, and you set in motion a spiral which cannot be stopped. It will establish a very bad precedent at this particular time, and that is an additional reason why this bill should not pass.

And, finally, what about the other thousands of District employees? Are you going to pick out the policemen and firemen and make them a preferred group? What about the clerks, what about the stenographers, what about the men who ride the garbage wagons, what about that great host of people in the employ of the municipal government of the District of Columbia at the present time? There is nothing said here about promotional increases and wage increases for them. I regard it as altogether bad legislation for the Congress, in considering the welfare of the District of Columbia, to take two selected groups out of all the employees of the District of Columbia and confer upon them promotions in pay, no matter how modest they may be.

There are the reasons. In the first place, the Commissioners are opposed, particularly Commissioner Young, who is charged with the operation of the police and fire departments; secondly, it will cost three-quarters of a million dollars; third, it starts a very bad spiral, which will have repercussions at the other end, and in a little while they will all be on the bandwagon and want promotions; fourth, it does not take account of thousands of other District of Columbia employees; and lastly, it occurs to me that that is pretty fair pay at this time, as indicated by the great number of applicants for places on the police and fire departments.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Am I to understand that the police department and also the fire department of the District are under one administrative head.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Commissioner Young looks after the policemen and the firemen in the District of Columbia. They share responsibility as between the two nonengineer Commissioners, although properly speaking, Commissioner Young is the one who has taken cognizance of this matter, and who has testified before the committee upon it. I look to him as sharing the major responsibility, and he has stated that he is frankly and bluntly opposed to this bill upon the ground that the District of Columbia cannot afford it.

If an additional reason is needed, let me say that it then becomes necessary for the subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee to find additional revenues, and you cannot pay money out of thin air, or pick money off gooseberry bushes; you have to raise taxes by raising the rate upon real estate and in other

ways find new sources of taxation, because the District can spend only so much money as is provided, either by a lump sum appropriation from Congress, or as provided by property owners, and people who reside here, in the form of taxation. So it becomes necessary to find an additional three-quarters of a million dollars in revenue. It was stated in subcommittee that there is a surplus from year to year. About two or three or four hundred thousand dollars are sometimes tagged as a surplus, but the important thing is that it is an apparent, rather than a real, surplus, for while they may be kicking back two or three hundred thousand dollars into the Treasury in other funds, there is as much as over a million dollars in obligations unpaid at the end of the year. So, when they talk about surpluses, by the time you have cast the books, and reckoned all the surplus against all obligations not required, you will find it is no surplus, after all.

There is nothing more for me to say. This bill came before the House once before. At that time the amount of promotion was twice as much as is carried in the present bill. The proponents then scaled it down, believing a smaller amount might have a greater appeal, but no amount of increased Government cash has any appeal for me at this time, and particularly so since the country is insistent on economy, and gentlemen should not forget, when we talk about the country, that it also includes the Nation's Capital, officially styled the District of Columbia. The people of that District are entitled to a break, as well as the taxpayers in other sections of the country.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes. It is no easy task to be a member of the committee on the District of Columbia, when we take into consideration all of the other committees that we have the pleasure of serving on, but we are trying to do the best we can for the District of Columbia and its people whom we serve. We are subjected to all sorts of criticism and condemnations by those who write editorials in newspapers, charging that the members of the Committee on the District of Columbia are trying to become dictators because of the fact that we have the audacity to raise our voices in protest of some of the things that happen here. It is a headache every minute that you are on the committee, but someone has to do the job.

This bill seeks to increase the pay of policemen and firemen who are employed in the District of Columbia. I am very much in sympathy with their problems, and I feel this increase is absolutely justified. I know of no other city in the United States where the work is as hard and as tedious as it is here, in speaking of our police department. You are in the National Capital, and anything can happen here. These men are not working just 8 or 9 hours a day, which was attested to not later than this morning by the Superintendent of Police. They are on duty 10 and 12 and 16 hours a day in a great many instances, and they are doing exceptionally good work in ap-

prehending burglars; thieves, and other criminals that do exist in the Nation's Capital.

They say if we increase the policemen and firemen, certainly we will have to increase the man who collects the garbage. The work of the garbage collector is not one-tenth as hazardous as that of the police department. Just this morning a police officer was shot while apprehending four criminals. They do not know yet whether he is going to live or not. It is not an easy job serving in the police or fire departments in Washington. Those men are living in a city where living conditions are much higher than they are back in our respective districts. There is not a Member of this House who will not admit that fact, that rents have gone up; that the cost of food and clothing has gone up. A great many of the boys refuse to buy in the District of Columbia because of the excessive costs. They wait until they go home. But the policemen and firemen of the District of Columbia have to live here. Their rents have increased. I dare say that 99.9 percent of the policemen and firemen are married men. Those who are single of course will be drafted into this war, but the married men will have to stay here and face this tremendous increase in the cost of living. Over 200 cities in the United States have increased the salaries of their policemen and firemen—over 200; mine, yours, and many other cities throughout this Nation. We were here just a short time ago asking for a pay adjustment of \$600 per year. I say to you that has been cut right in half. Certainly that is not asking an awful lot. You have a graduated scale here. It increases progressively as it goes along.

Now, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] says we cannot get the revenue. I do not know of a city in the United States where the tax rate is as low as it is in the District of Columbia. Yet, my friends, that will be contradicted when they say, "Oh, it is assessed on 100-percent valuation." Ninety percent of the cities in the United States are assessed on 100-percent valuation, and men from the East, the West, the North, and the South will attest to the fact that they are paying \$35 and \$40 per thousand. Yet here they pay \$17.50. It is about time that the taxation on real estate is raised here.

This morning I offered a suggestion. There is not anyone of us who wants to hurt the little home owner. We should do as our Federal Government is doing. It has set the precedent. The little fellow who owns his own home costing below \$7,000, will pay the same rate, \$1.75 per hundred. Let it remain there. Let us go up from \$7,000. Let us increase it progressively. Then you will get the very fellows who are living on the cream of the crop, who are making all the money in the District of Columbia.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I would like to tell my colleague, who was born in my district in the little village of St. Bernard, the people pay three times as much real estate

taxes as they pay in some cases here. I agree with him that there is a lot of merit to the promotion and reward for service for our police force in Washington.

But I call his attention to the fact that we are going to be called upon—I say “we” meaning the members of the subcommittee which makes appropriations for the District of Columbia—for perhaps a hundred more policemen, or even more than that. We should have a resurvey of the Budget estimate, which was made up last September and which is now out of date. I am sure that my chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is very agreeable to that. It is my suggestion that we go into conference with the legislative Subcommittee on the Fiscal Affairs of the District of Columbia, and in view of the fact that we are going to go all over this proposition of appropriations for the District of Columbia, salaries of police officers, salaries of firemen, salaries of everybody in the District of Columbia, that we lay this over until we have some real chance to discuss it sanely around the table, where we can actually get some official figures and know what we are doing. I think 20 minutes of debate on an important bill like this is a very, very short time. But I do not want to be in the position of being on record as unappreciative of the work of the police department and the fire department in this city. I happen to be a member of a volunteer fire department in my home town and I know some of the work that is being done by firemen in Washington, and policemen as well. It is getting more difficult to secure good policemen and good firemen. But I believe at this particular time it is inopportune to make an increase without taking into consideration the future of the police department, that has to be reviewed entirely by the committee.

I would like to say to the gentleman that I have 2 minutes of my own time which I yield back.

Mr. SCHULTE. I certainly thank the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I gladly yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. I just wanted to ask how the rate of pay compares with that in other cities comparable to Washington?

Mr. SCHULTE. We are below other cities that are in the same category as Washington would be.

Now, coming back to the financing of it, there is no question in my mind that so long as we continue to set this back and set it back, these men will never get an increase. If I am not mistaken, it has been 15 or 16 years since they have had an increase of any kind in the District of Columbia. Now, that is a long time. They have been the goats, so to speak, on this thing. They have not had a chance to present their case. They are presenting it now through the District of Columbia Committee.

I am frank to say that there were very, very few objections in the full committee on District of Columbia affairs. The subcommittee was unanimously in sympathy with it because of the fact that

most of those men, like myself, are paying exorbitant rents, exorbitant prices for food and cost of living.

We can readily appreciate what these men are going through, and I do hope that the House in its deliberate judgment will see fit to pass this bill. If we do not pass it now, Mr. Chairman, it is never going to pass, and these men are never going to get an increase in pay. I hope you will agree with the members of the District of Columbia Committee and vote for this bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I take occasion during this debate to commend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE] for his service on the District Committee, and especially his chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Police and Firemen. He has also given much attention to the Subcommittee on Public Health, Hospitals, and Charities, and other subcommittees of the full committee. He has given much time to the study of District affairs. I, of course, do not need to remind the membership of the long hours the members of the committee devote to the subject of District legislation. At times some of us on the committee or in the House are not in agreement on all matters that the gentleman endorses or presents to the membership, yet I think it is highly proper that as chairman of the full committee I once express my appreciation for attention to duties as exemplified by the work of the gentleman from Indiana.

On this subject I shall make only brief comment. These men to be helped are employed in a hazardous occupation. They have not been given increases which their labors merit. It is my hope that the proposal will be supported today.

Mr. SCHULTE. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wanted this time merely to state that during this year we have added 183 members to the police force of the District, and the Commissioners have testified that in the fiscal year 1943 they are going to ask for 100 more. Certainly with this added number the hours of duty can be so readjusted that there should be no complaint on the part of any individual policeman as to long hours.

I hope the bill will not pass, since it represents three-quarters of a million dollars.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired; all time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law No. 489 of the Seventy-first Congress (S. 2370) approved July 1, 1930, is hereby amended by striking out sections 1, 2, and 3 thereof, and inserting in place thereof the following new sections:

“Sec. 1. That the annual basic salaries of the officers and members of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, and the

White House Police shall be as follows: Major and superintendent, \$8,000; assistant superintendents, \$5,000 each; inspectors, \$4,500 each; captains, \$3,900 each; lieutenants, \$3,350 each; sergeants, \$3,050 each; privates, a basic salary of \$2,000 per year with an annual increase of \$140 in salary for 5 years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,700 is reached. All original appointments of privates shall be made at the basic salary of \$2,000 per year, and the first year of service shall be probationary.

“Sec. 2. That the annual basic salaries of the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be as follows: Chief engineer, \$8,000; deputy chief engineers, \$5,000 each; battalion chief engineers, \$4,500 each; fire marshal, \$5,000; deputy fire marshal, \$3,300; inspectors, \$2,960 each; captains, \$3,300 each; executive officer (captain), \$3,300; lieutenants, \$3,140 each; sergeants, \$2,900 each; superintendent of machinery, \$5,000; assistant superintendent of machinery, \$3,300; pilots, \$2,900 each; marine engineers, \$2,900 each; assistant marine engineers, \$2,760 each; marine firemen, \$2,400 each; privates, a basic salary of \$2,000 per year with an annual increase of \$140 in salary for 5 years or until a maximum salary of \$2,700 is reached. All original appointments of privates shall be made at the basic salary of \$2,000 per year, and the first year of service shall be probationary.

“Sec. 3. That privates of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, and the White House Police, and privates of the Fire Department shall be entitled to the following salaries: Privates who have served less than 1 year at the rate of \$2,000 per annum; privates who have served more than 1 year and less than 2 years, at the rate of \$2,140 per annum; privates who have served more than 2 years and less than 3 years, at the rate of \$2,280 per annum; privates who have served more than 3 years and less than 4 years, at the rate of \$2,420 per annum; privates who have served more than 4 years and less than 5 years, at the rate of \$2,560 per annum; privates who have served more than 5 years, at the rate of \$2,700 per annum.”

The provisions of this act shall be effective February 1, 1942.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN) having resumed the chair, Mr. HOBBS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6386) to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to conform with the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia, and also to conform with wages paid in many cities of the Nation, directed him to report the same back to the House without amendment with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHULTE) there were—ayes 34, noes 40.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The roll call is automatic.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 139, nays 123, not voting 169, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—139

Anderson, N. Mex.	Gregory	Ploeser
Arnold	Haines	Powers
Barnes	Hall	Rabaut
Bates, Ky.	Edwin Arthur	Ramspeck
Bloom	Harris, Ark.	Randolph
Boland	Harris, Va.	Rankin, Miss.
Bradley, Mich.	Harter	Rankin, Mont.
Butler	Healey	Reed, Ill.
Byrne	Hendricks	Richards
Canfield	Hill, Wash.	Robertson, Va.
Cannon, Mo.	Hobbs	Robinson, Utah
Cartwright	Hull	Rodgers, Pa.
Cason	Hunter	Rogers, Mass.
Cochran	Imhoff	Rogers, Okla.
Coffee, Wash.	Jackson	Rolph
Collins	Jacobsen	Sasser
Copeland	Jarman	Sauthoff
Costello	Johnson, Ind.	Schulte
Courtney	Kerr	Secrest
Cravens	Kirwan	Shafer, Mich.
Crosser	Kunkel	Shanley
Crowther	Lambertson	Short
Cunningham	Landis	Smith, Maine
D'Alesandro	Lane	South
Davis, Ohio	McCormack	Sparkman
Davis, Tenn.	McLaughlin	Spence
Delaney	MacIara	Starnes, Ala.
Dewey	Manasco	Stevenson
Douglas	Mansfield	Sullivan
Downs	Mason	Talbot
Dworshak	May	Tenerowicz
Eberhart	Mundt	Terry
Edmiston	Murray	Thill
Ellis	Nelson	Thom
Engel	Norrell	Traynor
Fish	Norton	Van Zandt
Fogarty	O'Brien, Mich.	Voorhis, Calif.
Forand	O'Brien, N. Y.	Weaver
Ford, Leland M.	O'Leary	Welch
Gearhart	O'Liver	West
Gehrmann	O'Toole	Whichel
Gilchrist	Patman	Woicott
Graham	Patrick	Wolfenden, Pa.
Granger	Peterson, Fla.	Woodrum, Va.
Grant, Ind.	Peterson, Ga.	Young
Green	Pfeiffer	Youngdahl
	William T.	
	Pittenger	

NAYS—123

Allen, La.	Ford, Miss.	Moser
Andersen, H. Carl	Fulmer	Nichols
Andresen, August H.	Gathings	Paddock
Angell	Gibson	Pearson
Arends	Gillie	Poage
Barden	Gore	Priest
Baumhart	Gossett	Reece, Tenn.
Beckworth	Grant, Ala.	Reed, N. Y.
Bell	Gwynne	Rees, Kans.
Bennett	Halleck	Rich
Bonner	Hancock	Rizley
Boren	Hare	Robertson, N. Dak.
Brooks	Harness	Robison, Ky.
Brown, Ga.	Heidinger	Rockefeller
Brown, Ohio	Hill, Colo.	Rockwell
Bryson	Hoffman	Russell
Bulwinkle	Holmes	Sheppard
Camp	Hope	Smith, Ohio
Carlson	Jenkins, Ohio	Smith, W. Va.
Carter	Jennings	Smith, Wis.
Chapman	Jensen	Springer
Chenoweth	Johns	Stearns, N. H.
Chiperfield	Johnson, Ill.	Stefan
Cleaver	Johnson, N. Y.	Sumner, Ill.
Coffee, Nebr.	Luther A.	Taber
Cooley	Jones	Talle
Cooper	Jonkman	Tarver
Cravford	Kean	Thomason
Creal	Kilburn	Tibbott
Curtis	Lanham	Tinkham
Dirksen	Larrabee	Vorys, Ohio
Disney	Lea	Ward
Domengaoux	LeCompte	Wasielewski
Dondero	McGregor	Whitten
Doughton	McIntyre	Whittington
Duncan	Mahon	Wickersham
Durham	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Elliott, Calif.	Meyer, Md.	Wolverton, N. J.
Elston	Michener	Woodruff, Mich.
Englebright	Millis, Ark.	Zimmerman
Folger	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—169

Allen, Ill.	Gillette	Murdock
Anderson, Calif.	Guyer	Myers, Pa.
Andrews	Hall	O'Connor
Baldwin	Leonard W.	O'Day
Barry	Harrington	O'Hara
Bates, Mass.	Hart	O'Neal
Beam	Hartley	Osmer
Beiter	Hébert	Pace
Bender	Heffernan	Patton
Bishop	Hess	Pfeifer
Blackney	Hinshaw	Joseph L.
Bland	Holbrook	Pierce
Boehne	Hook	Plauché
Bolton	Houston	Pumley
Boykin	Howell	Ramsay
Bradley, Pa.	Izac	Rivers
Buck	Jarrett	Romjue
Buckler, Minn.	Jenks, N. H.	Sabath
Buckley, N. Y.	Johnson, Calif.	Sacks
Burch	Johnson	Sanders
Burdick	Lyndon B.	Satterfield
Burgin	Johnson, Okla.	Scanlon
Byron	Johnson, W. Va.	Schaefer, Ill.
Cannon, Pa.	Kee	Schuetz
Capozzoli	Keefe	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Scrugham
Casey, Mass.	Kelley, Pa.	Shannon
Celler	Kelly, Ill.	Sheridan
Clark	Kennedy	Sikes
Claypool	Martin J.	Simpson
Cluett	Kennedy	Smith, Pa.
Cole, Md.	Michael J.	Smith, Va.
Cole, N. Y.	Keogh	Smith, Wash.
Colmer	Kilday	Snyder
Cox	Kinzer	Somers, N. Y.
Cu'kin	Kleberg	Steagall
Cullen	Klein	Stratton
Day	Knutson	Summers, Tex.
Dickstein	Kocalkowski	Sutphin
Des	Kopplemann	Sweeney
Dingell	Kramer	Thomas, N. J.
Ditter	Leavy	Thomas, Tex.
Drewry	Lesinski	Tolan
Eaton	Lewis	Treadway
Eliot, Mass.	Ludlow	Vincent, Ky.
Faddis	Lynch	Vinson, Ga.
Fellows	McGehee	Vree and
Fenton	McGranery	Wadsworth
Fitzgerald	McKeough	Walter
Fitzpatrick	McMillan	Weiss
Flaherty	Maas	Wene
Flannagan	Maciejewski	Wheat
Ford, Thomas F.	Magnuson	White
Gale	Marcantonio	Wigglesworth
Gamble	Martin, Mass.	Wilson
Gavagn	Merritt	Winter
Gerlach	Mitchell	Worley
Gifford	Mott	Wright

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Keefe against.

General pairs:

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Simpson.

Mr. Holbrook with Mr. Johnson of California.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Burch with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Stratton.

Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Ditter.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Osmer.

Mr. Bland with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Kinzer.

Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Boehne with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Cullen with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Plauché with Mr. Bishop.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Maas.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Bender.

Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Vreeland.

Mr. Beam with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Hook with Mr. Gillette.

Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Johnson of West Virginia with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Pierce with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Belter with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.

Mr. McKeough with Mr. Hess.

Mr. Kocalkowski with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Kilday with Mr. Gale.

Mr. Lewis with Mr. Wheat.

Mr. Kopplemann with Mr. Jarrett.

Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Ludlow with Mr. Wigglesworth.

Mr. Maciejewski with Mr. Gerlach.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Howell.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Buckler.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Marcantonio.

Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Leavy with Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Cox with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Patton with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Thomas of Texas with Mr. Knutson.

Mr. Vincent of Kentucky with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Day.

Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Flaherty with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mr. Thomas F. Ford with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. Murdock with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Guyer.

Mr. Steagall with Mr. Cluett.

Mr. Harrington with Mr. Fellows.

Mr. Pace with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Buck with Mr. Heffernan.

Mr. Ramsay with Mr. Sabath.

Mr. Sanders with Mrs. Bryon.

Mr. Romjue with Mr. Izac.

Mr. Burgin with Mr. Dickstein.

Mr. McGranery with Mr. Sweeney.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Summers of Texas with Mr. Kramer.

Mr. Snyder with Mr. Smith of Washington.

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Somers of New York.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Magnuson.

Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Walter.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Faddis.

Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Sacks.

Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Claypool.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Sheridan.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Houston.

Mr. Scanlon with Mr. Casey of Massachusetts.

Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Schuetz.

Mr. Wene with Mr. Sikes.

Mr. Lynch with Mr. Weiss.

Mr. Merritt with Mr. Mitchell.

Mr. Eliot of Massachusetts with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Fitzgerald.

Mr. Kee with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Shannon.

Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania with Mrs. O'Day.

Mr. Klein with Mr. Smith of Virginia.

Mr. BOGGS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this completes the legislation on the District of Columbia Calendar for the day.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include a speech made by Wheeler McMillen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow

row after the regular business of the day has been disposed of and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]?
There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech by the Honorable William Curran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESSANDRO]?
There was no objection.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio speech delivered by L. Metcalfe Walling, of the Wage and Hour Division, and also to include an article appearing in yesterday's New York Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY]?
There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Monsignor Ready, and an article by Brandon Bracken.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY]?
There was no objection.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a poem written by a friend of mine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF]?
There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK]?
There was no objection.

LT. ERNEST H. DUNLAP, JR.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to have the opportunity to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD citation in my congressional district of which I am very proud, the citation of Lt. Ernest H. Dunlap, Jr., one of the real heroes of Pearl Harbor.

It will be pleasant to stand here and describe his acts of heroism, but this I shall not do save to present herewith the citation itself. It follows:

The Navy Cross was awarded and presented to Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Ernest H. Dunlap, Jr., at 4 p. m. Thursday, March 19, being cited in the following language:

Citation: "For distinguished service in line of his professional exceptional courage, coolness, and devotion to duty during the attack on the fleet in Pearl Harbor, T. H., by Japanese forces on December 7, 1941. When Lieutenant (Junior Grade) Dunlap found that his services in the fourth top as Spot O, on the U. S. S. Nevada, were not required, he joined

the secondary battery, supervised manning of guns and organization of ammunition supply, and maintained an accurate fire on low-flying enemy aircraft until seriously wounded by the explosion of an enemy bomb. Despite his wounded condition he assisted with the wounded until he himself collapsed."

FRANK KNOX,
Secretary of the Navy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Kewanee Star Courier, of Kewanee, Ill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD]?
There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow and also on the succeeding day at the conclusion of the legislative business in order for the day and after any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes on each day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?
There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?
There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. If those who have special orders for today do not object. There are three or four prior special orders.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact my colleague from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE] has to catch a train and I am on ahead of him, I would like to yield my place to him with the understanding that I immediately follow him, and I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD]?
There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WHY DISCRIMINATE AGAINST THE MILK PRODUCER IN THE MIDDLE WEST?

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity of thanking the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD] for his kindness—and he has always been that way since he has been a Member of this House.

Mr. Speaker, there is a condition existing in this country today affecting the

farmers who produce milk in my district in Indiana which also affects the milk-producing farmers in the districts of many of the Members of this Congress which I think ought to be brought to the attention of the Congress and of the people of the United States. The Department of Agriculture has gotten the dairy industry in the United States so completely mixed up and so completely befuddled that it is impossible for any farmer to know where he stands and why he stands there. In the hope that something will be done very quickly to change present conditions of the milk markets throughout the United States, I am going to tell you very briefly what it is all about and suggest some remedies.

The most outstanding feature of this situation is that the farmers in my district in Indiana who produce milk, although they are paying identical prices for dairy feed with farmers in the East, less a freight differential, and although our farm labor costs us considerably more than that in the East, we are getting less money for our milk than the farmers in the East. The remarkable part about this is that the Department of Agriculture, through its Marketing Division, is controlling the price to be paid to the farmers in my district and is controlling the prices to be paid to the farmers in the eastern districts, to which I shall refer. For some unknown reason I am getting in the neighborhood of \$2.44 per hundredweight for my milk, which is shipped to the Chicago market for the consumption of the people of that city, while the farmers who ship milk to the city of Washington at the present time receive for first-class milk, including premiums for cattle and barn scores, approximately \$4 per hundredweight. This represents a difference of approximately 12 cents a gallon. Everybody who has had any experience in the dairy business knows that if a farmer can make 3 cents a gallon profit he can quickly become well fixed if he has more than 10 cows. What I have been trying to find out for a long time, and what I think this Congress ought to find out now, is why the Department of Agriculture, through its Marketing Division, has fixed the price of milk to the farmers in my district in Indiana at something in the neighborhood of 12 cents a gallon less than that same Department has fixed to be paid to the farmers in Maryland and Virginia, who supply the District of Columbia with its milk. I think it is time for this Congress to seriously ask and to insist on being told why this terrific discrimination is made against my constituents and the constituents of many others who are in this Congress. I think it is time for this Congress to find out also why the Department of Agriculture, with the millions of dollars which we appropriate for this operation, seems to be devoting itself to the fixing of these discriminatory prices against your constituents and mine, and fixing prices for a large proportion of the fluid-milk markets of the United States, and have their noses stuck so deep into the milk situation that they cannot see straight; but the Department

of Justice has to be the one to discover that over 100 individuals and corporations in the Chicago area have been guilty of a conspiracy to fix cheese prices and thereby control the cheese markets in the United States.

With all the money we appropriate for the Department of Agriculture it certainly seems to me that we ought to ask why the Department of Agriculture in its control of the milk situation did not long ago do something about the cheese situation which the Department of Justice has unearthed and which constitutes a major scandal.

Some years ago we were told that the law of supply and demand had to be scrapped and thrown out the window, and that so far as farm products were concerned, the Department of Agriculture, through its Marketing Division, was going to solve the whole matter by what they called a planned economy and a full granary program. Now they have picked out certain milk-producing areas in the East which are strongly organized and, therefore, politically powerful, and have given to them tremendous increases in the prices they receive for their milk, and have attempted to justify it by saying that these markets are short of milk, and that the law of supply and demand must fix the price. In other words, when they want to give to some favored farm areas in the East a big boost in price, they reduce the process of the planned economy, and chuck it overboard in favor of the old natural law of supply and demand. As a matter of fact, there is no shortage and never has been a shortage of milk in the United States. There is more than enough milk in this country today to take care of all of our needs, both for fluid milk, cheese, and other byproducts, but these "highfalutin," eastern fluid-milk markets which command these more attractive prices have been rigged through the setting up of stringent health regulations with fancy frills and didos, paraded under the guise of health, but actually designed as barriers to keep milk from coming from my district in Indiana and from the districts of many of you gentlemen here, into these eastern markets and competing for this attractive price.

I want to warn this Congress now, and I want to warn the Department of Agriculture now, and particularly do I want to warn its Secretary, that unless something is done to protect the milk-producing farmers in my district, and in the other districts so affected, that I am going to do everything in my power to prevent the future appropriation of millions and millions of dollars to the Department of Agriculture which we have appropriated in the past for the purpose of straightening out this situation, and unless the Secretary of Agriculture gets busy now and actually does something about equalizing the fluid-milk prices among all farmers in the United States. It is high time that somebody does something to keep this country from being divided up into 48 sovereignties with trade barriers in between so as to effectively create a surplus in one location and effectively create a shortage in another, to the detriment of the one section and to the benefit

of the other section. It is high time that this Congress got serious about this matter and did something about it; but even if I have to stand up here alone, I promise you that I am going to do everything in my power to protect the milk-producing farmers of the United States who have been discriminated against by the Department of Agriculture in favor of others, to the point of objecting to every appropriation which the Marketing Division of the Department of Agriculture asks for, and to keep on doing it until I get some results, or until the Secretary of Agriculture fully realizes and appreciates his responsibility to my constituents, and to those of many others of you who are listening to me, and straightens out this unholy mess.

Mr. Speaker, please let it be understood that I am not advocating an increase in price to the consumers of Chicago, or to the consumers of any other market in the United States. I believe that the people of this country are paying enough for this milk at this time, but some attention has got to be paid by somebody to the terrific profits which are being made by the distributors of fluid milk. They must be told that they will have to cut out all the frills and doodads they have been using for many years. It is common knowledge in the industry that the business of producing milk is so extravagantly conducted that nobody, except the gigantic monopolistic corporations, can remain in the business in the big cities because of the terrific competition which they create through their expensive methods. Why, gentlemen, they literally throw money away to create highly adorned and fancy-shaped bottles. They spend millions a year on special deliveries. I have known milk distributors to send a truck 10 miles through the city of Washington to deliver a gill of cream to a customer. That gill of cream costs the customer about 18 cents, and costs the distributor about \$2 to deliver it. They do this because they want to eliminate the small distributor by making it impossible for him to compete with this kind of service. They put all kinds of fancy caps on the bottles under the guise of health, and in many large areas these distributors refuse to put a deposit on the bottle bought in a store so as to reduce their cost and allow the milk to be sold to the consumers at a low price. I am very reliably informed that in the city of Washington alone it costs the dairies over half a million dollars a year for bottles. You all know that the consumer is paying for this, and I say to you that the paying of a deposit of 3 cents on each bottle purchased at a store would practically entirely eliminate this cost and give the distributors almost half a million dollars to return to the consumers in the form of a lower priced milk.

With the war situation as it is today, and with full knowledge that rubber tires for milk trucks may very soon be unavailable, the distributors of milk throughout this country are going merrily on their way with everyday deliveries, and in some instances, two deliveries a day, wearing out the tires, wearing out the precious metals in the trucks, burning

precious gasoline and lubricating oils, and using labor very badly needed for war production, all for the purpose of keeping the price of milk to the consumer at a high level and eliminating the small man from the business.

Now, I ask you all, when are we going to do something about this, and what are we going to do? It is a challenge to this Congress, and I say to you that so far as I am concerned, I shall never cease my efforts to bring about some orderly procedure by the Department of Agriculture in the fixing of prices to be paid to farmers which will give every farmer, no matter in what part of the country who may produce milk, a decent price for his milk which will allow him to have a fair margin of profit. I intend to bring this matter to the attention of this Congress again, particularly when appropriation time rolls around and when the Secretary of Agriculture comes up here and tells us what a swell job he is doing for the farmers of America. But for the present, I want to challenge the Secretary of Agriculture to tell us why the farmers in my district, of whom I am one, now receive approximately 12 cents a gallon less for their milk than do the farmers in this eastern market, although both markets are under rigid supervision and control of the Secretary of Agriculture.

I said to you that I was going to suggest some possible remedies to this situation and how they can be brought about. Here they are: In the first place, the Secretary of Agriculture should be required to explain why he is favoring one milk market over another and told that he must equalize the markets and do it immediately. He has full power and authority under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, passed by this Congress, and all he has to do to bring about the change is to properly use the power of this legislation. The farmers can be given a decent price for their fluid milk all over the United States if these trade barriers between the States, erected under the guise of public health, are torn down, and the citizens of every State given an equal opportunity to buy and sell their product in every other State without the payment of tariffs in the form of large money expenditures to comply with foolish and unnecessary so-called health regulations.

Through the powers conferred by this Congress on the President of the United States and on various administrative agencies, to effectively and vigorously prosecute our war effort, the gigantic corporations which control the distribution of fluid milk in this country can certainly be made to do certain things which will effectively reduce their cost of operation and which will effectively permit a substantial reduction in the price of fluid milk to the consumer and at the same time permit a decent profit to be paid to the farmer. May I suggest that the first thing that these distributors be compelled to do is to eliminate all of these high costing and fancy bottle caps, which are costing the industry millions of dollars a year; a compulsory deposit on every bottle of milk which is sold in the stores of the large cities; a

compulsory every-other-day delivery of milk instead of daily and sometimes twice-daily deliveries; the elimination of all special deliveries except in cases of real emergencies; the elimination of costly frills in the adornment of milk bottles and cartons; the elimination of all foolish, unnecessary, and costly health regulations.

This latter remedy can be brought about through the compulsory adoption in the large metropolitan areas of the United States of the United States Public Health Service fluid milk regulations. All of you gentlemen may not know it, but this Congress has appropriated literally millions of dollars to the United States Public Health Service to develop a simple, plain, expedient, and inexpensive set of regulations governing the production and distribution of fluid milk. The Chicago market has adopted these regulations and nobody will contend that the people of that city are or have been in danger because of these regulations. Other large cities have adopted these regulations and they are working beautifully, but we find in the East many large markets which have completely ignored the Public Health Service regulations and have set up their own silly and highly costly rules. In these cases do we find the Secretary of Agriculture attempting to encourage the adoption of United States Public Health Service regulations for the purpose of reducing the cost of producing milk? No. To the contrary, we find the Secretary of Agriculture encouraging the continuance of other regulations by fixing a price to the farmers which will enable them, not only to comply with these costly regulations, but to continue to build them up. I have told this Congress before about some of the silly things which are provided in the health regulations of the District of Columbia. Every cow on this market must be furnished daily with four hemstitched towels, but you Members of Congress, who go to the Mayflower Hotel for dinner, only get one, and if you eat three meals a day there you will only get three altogether.

Now, who is paying for these hemstitched towels which the cows are using? The farmer must buy them and in order to stay in business he must pass the cost along to the consumer. United States Public Health Service regulations have no such silly rules, but the trouble is we cannot get the Department of Agriculture to support the United States Public Health Service program which is another department of our Government and which has been universally recognized by the people as a sound and sensible set of health rules in the production of milk.

It is my hope and expectation that this Congress will really do something to bring about a decent and sensible solution of the milk problem for the farmer and the consumer. Let us begin by breaking down the trade barriers between the States, so that if the good people of New York or Philadelphia and the other eastern cities want milk from my district, they can get it at a fair price. As it is now, they can't get it at any price. The health authorities of these cities keep it out. What we need to do is to

say to the people of the United States that all milk produced under reasonable health regulations is fit to drink and let them get it at a reasonable price no matter where it comes from. This will help all the farmers of the country and will assist in building strong minds and bodies so badly needed by our people in this grave hour of peril.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is a distinguished Democrat from a district that is very close to mine. Our interests are much the same. I wonder if the gentleman thinks our farmers in Michigan are being treated fairly.

Mr. SCHULTE. No; I do not. That is the reason I have included your farmers, because they come under that Chicago milkshed that attempts to establish a price for us of \$2.44 for the same kind of milk for which these men here are receiving \$4. That is the point I cannot understand.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. May I add that because of climatic conditions we must build more securely and soundly, and have a heavier investment.

Mr. SCHULTE. By far, I would say.

In addition, in this particular area we find that they graze about 2 months in the year longer than we do, which, of course, gives them a decided advantage here; yet, in spite of all this, our prices fluctuate but theirs remain stationary.

As I said before, I do not want the cost of this milk to the consumer to be increased, because the minute that happens, consumption will be cut down, and we are trying to get milk to the people. Yet I cannot understand why that terrific differential should exist between the Middle West and the East, and why these barriers should be established, and established by the Department of Agriculture. If it is true that they can establish sheds which would be barriers for milk, which they are, why can they not establish barriers for potatoes, for butter, for eggs, for meats, or for anything else, if that is legally right?

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

SUSPENSION OF THE 40-HOUR WEEK

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I was tremendously interested in two items that appeared on the front page of the Washington Post, Saturday, March 21. These items pertained to the fight that is put on against the suspension of the 40-hour week.

I was particularly interested in Mr. Philip Murray's statement that this was a "blitzkrieg on the part of labor baiters and enemies of government." Also at the top of the item, "C. I. O. calls 'extraordinary' meeting of constituent unions here Monday to resist Capitol drive for labor legislation." On that same page in the adjoining column and to the lower right

appeared another heading, "General Motors, union clash over double pay for holidays." In this item it stated that the C. I. O. are clashing with the General Motors over the question of double pay for work on holidays and that they wished to include Armistice Day in the holiday list. They also demanded flat \$1 a day wage increase with wage boosts every 90 days and a \$100 defense bond in lieu of vacation pay and the strengthening of the shop steward system.

I have always said that the C. I. O. union was one of the most destructive forces in our war program that could be found; that it was shot through with subversive interests who did not have the welfare of this country at heart; that the leadership was made up in many instances of socialistic, communistic, high-jacking, un-American, outlaw labor leaders that were misleading, overriding, betraying, and selling out for their own financial interest, the decent American rank-and-file men, who had been forced into the union against their will; that this great rank and file had never been permitted to honestly vote on strikes; that the orders were shoved down their throats, whether the rank and file liked it or not; that the C. I. O., in order to bolster its false position for those in power, had to resort to forgery, as they did in the Allis-Chalmers strike wherein 2,200 forged votes were used to control a strike election.

You are all familiar with the despicable Japanese negotiations prior to December 7. You know that Japan had its peace envoys here in Washington talking peace while at the same time it was moving its ships in to strike at Pearl Harbor.

It appears to me that Philip Murray now occupies this same position, in that he comes to Washington and prates in his demagogic way about what we have to do in our war effort. He would like to create the impression that he is here at Washington to help the war effort. He carries his demagogic, honey-coated words in his left hand about help to America, but in his right hand he carries the long, double-edged knife with which he would disembowel American war efforts, and this is their demand for more pay, more money, while thousands of our men are dying for the want of material, which his outfit is refusing now to furnish and has refused to furnish in the past because he has to have more money.

Can you square this action with the fact that men are dying for \$21 a month and a man like Murray is demanding more money, refusing to work over 40 hours a week, wanting time and a half for weekdays and double time for Sundays and holidays and where his men's lives are not in danger at all? I cannot square this out; neither can 95 percent of the American people.

Is it possible that Philip Murray, together with his other socialistic, outlaw labor subchiefs, has become so insatiated with the idea of his power that he has an acute case of dementia praecox with delusions of grandeur; that he has seen where they have beaten into submission so many honest labor men that he can now beat into the same submission the whole population of the United States?

My opinion is that if this is true, this gentleman, Philip Murray, is due for quite a shocking cure of his disease of dementia praecox with delusions of grandeur, because the American people are not going to send their sons and relatives to battle to die and have this man sabotage their war program.

Let us look into this man's past record. Is not this the man who might be dubbed "Short Memory" Murray? "Short Memory" Murray conveniently forgets that he is the man responsible largely for the loss of 17,000,000 man-days between January 1 and August 1 of last year, and God knows how many more prior to that date. "Short Memory" Murray would now like to get a scapegoat to blame for his own past actions. "Short Memory" Murray would try to forget when the generals of our Army and the admirals of our Navy pled with him to cease his strikes and told him that he was then ruining the war program of the United States. "Short Memory" Murray was told then that we did not have any powder. "Short Memory" Murray was asked to cease his strikes, his slow-downs, and the insistence upon his socialistic rights while denying any rights whatsoever to the rank and file of the laboring man—namely, his right to vote on strikes—and to the rank and file of the average American citizen who wanted to have an effective and efficient defense program. "Short Memory" Murray forgets that he tried to make O. P. M. his scapegoat and lay the blame upon them, when the responsibility, the fault, and the guilt for our armed forces not having airplanes, munitions, tanks, and so forth, was clearly his. "Short Memory" Murray would like to forget that he was told that at least he should come into the court of public opinion with clean hands and not with hands dripping in the blood of the men whom he had betrayed and who were then and now trying to defend this country.

The gall of such men as Murray is unbelievable, but, after all, is not this the kind of gall that goes with an acute case of dementia praecox with delusions of grandeur?

Does this "Short Memory" Murray now expect us, or any part of the American population, to have any confidence in him after he has so thoroughly sabotaged our program in the past? Does he think he can now come in and insinuate himself into a responsible and prominent position in this program and have the American people accept him? I say that he cannot, and that he should not be permitted to have a single word to say; that upon the ground of his past record I say further that I believe it to be the duty of the President of the United States to throw this man Murray out of the picture in no unmistakable terms. If the President wanted to really create more confidence in our people, he would do this and perhaps he would include those who have helped Murray such as Hillman, Perkins, Bridges, Freytag, and all of this ilk, and perhaps he would turn a little attention to the Attorney General, who is prone to consider the rights of the minorities, split hairs over them, and destroy the rights of the great majority.

"Short Memory" Murray has stated that the demand for the suspension of the 40-hour week is propaganda. Perhaps this is because it did not emanate from his highjacking, racketeering, socialistic, outlaw minority saboteurs in the C. I. O. Mr. Murray is going to learn another lesson here and find out that this demand comes from about 98 percent of the great American people who are fed up with such of his actions as they have been in the past, and they are now fed up to the point where they are no longer going to tolerate any of the past procedure.

I think that "Short Memory" Murray is just as insincere in his statements and professions here as he was when he said he would give all-out aid to our defense program in the past. He made those professions with one hand and continued to strike with the other.

Reviewing the past record, Murray and others were told that they would rue the day when these things went on and that there would be a day of reckoning.

That day of reckoning has now arrived and if Mr. Murray has not realized it, he has caused the loss of thousands of lives, millions of dollars worth of equipment, loss of tremendous territory, all of which can be attributed to his refusal to properly produce while there was still time, and it is now summed up in the defeats we are handed with the explanation "too little—too late." "Short Memory" Murray, I indict you here and now and say that the guilt and responsibility is still yours regardless of your honey-coated words. If ever a man has injured the United States you have done so, and in my opinion your injury has been far worse than that of Benedict Arnold, and further than that I see no reason in God's world why you should not be subject to the same penalty as any traitor in time of war should be subject to. Further, in my opinion, this continual demand for more money, your refusal to work the necessary hours, your demand for socialistic set-ups in industry are far worse in this hour of stress, need, and crisis, than any treason or fifth column activity could possibly be.

"Short Memory" Murray, if you have not realized it yet you have injured the cause of honest unionism far more than any man ever did.

We have stood on the floor of Congress for a series of years and pointed out to you the things that you were doing, and told you what was happening, but apparently you saw nothing except the money you could place in the pockets of the subversive racketeers within your ranks and that increase of sinister power that these small minorities consisting of yourself and a few others were wielding over the helpless and defenseless worker. You have done well for yourself, at least temporarily, but when the final story is written there may be an entirely different picture, as far as not only yourself, but every person in the United States is concerned. I say this, having in mind the parallel actions of your counterpart in France. In my opinion you have certainly carried out that European program, and that has been pointed out to you many, many

times. You cannot say you were uninformed, but if your ideas prevail this country may be as prostrate before the enemy as is prostrate France today.

This country is at war today, and I say it is the duty of the administration to come out with a strong statement in which it will be backed by 95 percent of the public, in connection with the suspension of the 40-hour week. Is this administration going to ask that our people do without automobiles, without sugar, without gasoline, and let this "Short Memory" Murray get away with the things that he is trying to get away with? If it is necessary, our people will do without everything that they are asked to do without, but at the same time, they are not going to do without these things and see these outlaw racketeers enrich themselves at the people's expense, and neither are they going to much longer sit idly by and see these socialistic gains go on under the guise of social advances and see billions of dollars of our Treasury funds thrown away and wasted and paid out to racketeers. Particularly, when their sons and men are fighting and giving their lives, spilling their blood for \$21 a month. I say to the administration, that it had better open its ears to public opinion, because this public is now thoroughly aroused, on not only this matter, but many others and they are no longer going to stand for the things which have been going on. This administration cannot join forces with "Short Memory" Murray and through their publicity departments say that this demand for the suspension of the 40-hour week is propaganda of any small group of American citizens. This demand comes to me from all over California, and after consulting my colleagues, I find that it comes from practically every State in the Union.

Every single one of us would give everything that we have to help win this war but we are not going to sit idly by and see our men die on foreign fields, and at the same time be betrayed and sold out at home, and particularly in our Nation's Capital. I think I am a friend of the administration when I advise them of these things and ask that this action which amounts to treason be stopped and stopped immediately.

Does this administration believe that it instills any confidence in the buyers of our war-saving stamps and bonds, where poor people are asked to contribute their nickels and dimes to find out that these men are demanding 10 and 12 times as much per month as our fighters are getting, who are dying in the field? Does the administration think that it inspires confidence in these buyers to see the billions being handed to the group headed by "Short Memory" Murray? If so, it had better lend an ear to the voice of the great American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PRODUCTION OF ALUMINUM

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in southern California is located more than 50 percent of the total air-

craft production capacity of the country. Airplanes require a tremendous amount of aluminum for their construction, and at present the principal bottleneck is to be found not in labor or airplane management or production facilities but in the supply of metals. It would have seemed logical, in view of the fact that the aluminum had to be used in southern California, to have located some of the new aluminum plants built with Government money in that area. Indeed, a very large aluminum ingot plant is being constructed there at present. But when it came to locating the aluminum sheet rolling mills, it was decided to locate part of this capacity in the vicinity of Spokane, Wash., and part of it near Chicago. I am utterly unable to see the logic of this decision. It means that raw material will be shipped to Los Angeles to be made into aluminum ingots at the new ingot plant, and then the ingots must be shipped either to the Canadian border or else to Chicago or Louisville in order to be rolled into sheets, and then the sheets must be shipped back to Los Angeles again to be put into the airplanes. The unnecessary burden on our transportation system in this situation is obvious.

Southern California does not expect a lot of new war industries to be located in our area. But we do think it is wise and no more than fair for us to have a balanced industrial unit for aircraft production instead of leaving us with everything except the sheet rolling mill which would have enabled us to supply the requirements of our aircraft industries with a very small transportation cost indeed.

If the objection is raised that new plants should be located in the interior because the Japs might bomb our coastal areas we would reply that we would enter no argument whatsoever against the location of brand-new aircraft or other factories at further distances from the coast, but that in the case of this sheet mill, we feel the situation is altogether different. The Japs will not try to bomb us any harder if we have the sheet mill than they would without it. And furthermore, if anybody is going to indulge in wild conversation about moving whole factories away from the Pacific coast we want to ask them what they are going to do about the oil wells and the shipyards which cannot possibly be moved and also about the three and one half million people who live in the Los Angeles area. The simple truth about the business is that we must, we can, and we will successfully defend this area against attack and I do not believe there is anyone who would disagree with me about that.

I return therefore, to ask the question once again: "Why was the one vital and final link that would have given southern California and the Nation a balanced industrial unit for the production of airplanes in our area taken away from us and moved 1,400 and 2,000 miles away?"

I do not know the reasons nor question the motives that led to this. I do know it will make it more difficult after the war for effective competition to be established in the production of aluminum. I

also know it will place the automobile companies now going into airplane production in a more favorable position in comparison to our experienced aircraft manufacturing companies when it comes to getting necessary materials.

I have absolute confidence in Mr. Donald Nelson. But I reiterate here what I have said many times before and what I have put into a bill, namely, that Mr. Nelson ought not to have to depend upon the assistance of anyone who draws his pay from any private corporation or organization or who is not directly and exclusively on the pay roll of Uncle Sam.

Mr. Speaker, I want now to address myself to another subject which has been very much before the House in recent days—that is, the subject of labor legislation. I have studied this question. I have studied everything about it. I shall cast my vote in accordance with whatever I believe to be best for winning this war for the United States. I shall not cast it in accordance with any reference to my own opportunities or chances for reelection. I think the consideration of it should be pointed at the question of what is going to increase production, and I do not think any other consideration should enter. I do not think, for example, that this is a good time, with the cost of living going up, to institute a Nation-wide wage cut. Yet that is what some people are advocating, without perhaps knowing it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does the gentleman from California believe it to be necessary to provide incentive pay to workmen or anybody else in the country to get them to produce to win the war?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not believe it to be necessary to do anything to get labor to produce in this country. My belief is that the average worker and the average everyone else is eager to do just one thing—to help America win this war. Further, I think that for anybody to even suggest that there could possibly be a general strike or anything like it is extremely bad policy and harmful and unfair. There just are not going to be any strikes that interfere with our war effort. What happened at North American Aircraft settled that once and for all.

I believe it would be a mistake for Congress to pass a bill which would amount simply to a blanket wage cut over practically all the country, but particularly among unorganized, low-paid workers, who are not organized and have no collective-bargaining agreements. I have taken the trouble to investigate the average number of hours that are now being worked. The average number of hours worked in all our war industries is in excess of 48; as I believe it should be. Therefore, if we repeal the Wage and Hour Act, or suspend it, without taking any other action at all, we shall not have increased the number of hours worked, and all we shall have done is institute a pay cut.

Now it occurs to me, that unless the House wants to cut the wages of labor

by law—and I do not believe it does—then if the House is going to consider extending the standard workweek to 48 hours at the same time there could and should be an adjustment of basic pay rates to make up for that loss. On the basis of present hours being worked, if we suspend the Wages and Hours Act we will not increase hours, but we will cut pay about 8 percent in most of the industries of the country. I ask the Members—will that help win the war?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield. Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman does believe, however, that no group of people in the United States needs incentive pay to carry on their part of the war program?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Let me answer the gentleman in this way. We are operating all our industry at present on the theory that industry requires a certain margin of profit, are we not? And, in some cases, industry is getting a very gigantic margin of earnings which I think is a problem Congress needs to deal with because I think some of these profits are unconscionable. Indeed, I proposed to the Ways and Means Committee that top excess-profits tax rates should be 95 percent. If that were done we would be in a much different position asking sacrifices from other groups. At the same time, we have little businesses that are going broke because they are not in this field and this is not just and equitable. I think we ought to recognize this in our tax laws too, and I propose a \$10,000 exemption for small businesses for that reason. We have got to recognize this, I will say to the gentleman from Ohio, and either we have got to make up our minds we are going to go ahead permitting a margin of profit and a fair wage, doing the best we can with the nearest approximation we can make to our ordinary system in America. If we decide to go ahead on that basis there are bound to be some maladjustments from time to time—some places where things will not work perfectly. We have either got to do that and take a constructive attitude toward our production effort or else we have got to say we cannot get along this way.

Then we will have to consider what people really mean when they talk about drafting capital and labor and what that involves. Of course, you could cut out all these things; you could cut out all profits, all overtime pay, all labor-union activities; but if you are going to do those things, then it must be Uncle Sam that everybody is working for, directly and not a private employer. We can draft people to work for their Government, just as we have drafted men for the Army. But we cannot draft anyone to work for another man's profit. Now, I hope and believe we can win through without taking these extreme steps. But some of the demands now being made on Congress for putting everyone more nearly in the same boat with the men in the armed forces have got to be thought through fearlessly to see what they lead to.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. If the gentleman will allow this observation, he undoubtedly has read the Truman committee report?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I have.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does the gentleman think Congress has done as much as it should to correct the situations which were revealed in that report?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does the gentleman refer to the latest report they made just after they returned from the Pacific coast?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It is called the Truman report, and it is the one that refers to the building of all of these cantonments. I refer to the overcharges and graft in connection with contractors involved in the construction of cantonments, defense houses, and so forth, as was revealed by the Truman report.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman and I will say to the gentleman that I think we could do more. I think we could end these excess profits. I think we could provide severe penalties against provable graft by anyone—contractor, walking delegate, or anyone else. I think there are certain things that labor has been responsible for which have retarded production. Some of them frankly I do not know how to get at by legislation. I am afraid there are a few instances where there have been restrictions on production imposed. Such things should be stopped. I do not find the wage-hour law has retarded production up to this date at all. I do think double time for Sundays and holidays has, and that there should not be double time paid unless a man has worked more than 6 days in a week. But I think the biggest bottleneck of all that we have had has been the shortage of certain metals which is the direct result of the refusal of some of the great monopoly corporations to permit expansion of that industry to take place sooner than it did. Now you ask me whether Congress has done the best it could. Congress is a National Legislature. Congress can lay out matters of general policy, but it cannot go out and organize production nor can it build ships or airplanes. But, Mr. Chairman, let me say that the one thing Congress could do that would help more than anything else would be to lay down a policy now for the duration of the war and then quit agitating against the fellows who are actually building the planes and tanks and guns every couple of weeks and keeping everybody upset about the matter. If we are going to legislate at all I think we ought to put in this bill a broad statement or policy regarding the important questions that may come before the War Labor Board for the duration of the war. Such action would have to be fair and just all around, but it might be a great help to the Board.

If I can be shown anything that is really retarding production, I will vote against that thing. But I will not support a move to cut low-paid labor just because it can be gotten away with on the pretext of it being a war measure when in reality it is no such thing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include an editorial from the Mobile Register.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

THE 40-HOUR WEEK

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be so much misinformation going to the country from various sources that I shall attempt to present a few facts in the hope that they may be published as widely as has been the misinformation.

This House has for some days listened to attacks on the Wage and Hour Act. Some of the gentlemen who have made them fought this legislation when it was introduced. They are still fighting it. All the groups which opposed enactment of a statute to give underprivileged workers a living wage are once more active and vocal in their denunciation of what they call the 40-hour law, and their point of view is receiving wide circulation from the press, by way of radio, and through the propaganda activities of certain groups.

All this clamor has built up the impression in the minds of many people that American workingmen are quitting their jobs on war production when they have worked a 40-hour week. That is the impression certain groups and individuals want to create for the purpose of destroying all laws which protect labor. Their tactics serve to arouse discontent among Americans and to breed disunity, and thus to play the game that Hitler wants played and that cashes in the chips for him and his gangsters.

Now, as to the facts, and they show conclusively that the plants where men are making the guns, tanks, planes, and ships, and other war equipment, are working many more than 40 hours per week.

Here is the record from a recent survey of war industries by the Bureau of Labor Statistics: 80.3 percent of our aircraft plants are working 120 hours or more a week; 64.2 percent are working 140 hours or more a week; 37.4 percent are working 160 hours or more a week.

In the aluminum industry 85 percent are working 80 hours or more, 55 percent 120 hours or more, and 30 percent 160 or more.

On blast furnaces 99.5 percent are working 80 hours or more each week, 97 percent 120 hours or more, and 80.3 percent 160 or more hours a week.

In chemicals, 100 percent are working 120 hours or more a week, and 85.1 percent 160 hours or more.

In shipbuilding, 92.1 percent of the yards are working 80 hours or more, 72.5 percent 120 hours or more, and 33.3 percent 160 hours or more.

Other war-industry plants surveyed show the same high percentages of plants working three- and four-shift operations of 40 hours each every week.

A compilation of data showing the proportion of workers employed overtime and the average amount of overtime worked by these workers in 16 important war industries in January 1942 showed that 96 percent of the workers in the machine tool accessory industry were working about 56 hours a week, 91.2 percent in the shipbuilding industry were working an average of 12.3 hours of overtime each week, 91.2 percent in the locomotive industry were working an average of 12.8 hours overtime every week, and in the engine industry 66.5 percent of the workers worked an average of 14.3 hours of overtime a week.

That is the answer to those who would have us believe that patriotic American workers are holding war production down to a 40-hour week.

The so-called 40-hour week does not, and never has, restricted the hours of work a man may put in. It simply provides that time and a half be paid for the hours he works over 40 each week. It has relieved the plight of a large underpaid group of workers. Without its protection—and I am quoting from an editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 8:

The unorganized workers in textile mills and the southern lumber industry, for instance, would soon sink back into their former misery and poverty.

Maybe that is exactly what some people want to see happen.

There has been the same sort of a campaign of misrepresentation against labor in connection with industrial disputes. Such propaganda has apparently taken hold, for many letters are being written indicating widespread belief that strikes are seriously impairing the war production effort and that legislation is needed to prevent strikes in the interest of the all-out war effort.

But the fact is that both the War and Navy Departments are on record that no such legislation is necessary. That also goes for the War Production Board.

The record shows that for the months of January and February 1942 the man-days lost by work stoppages in war plants was equal to about three-one-hundredths of 1 percent of the time worked. None of these strikes was authorized by the national officers of the unions, they were all of very short duration, and the lost time per capita did not average over 2 days.

American labor is patriotic. American workingmen and women are committed to an all-out effort for the land they love, for the institutions they cherish, and for the rights and privileges which they enjoy and which they will hand down to their children. They can be counted upon to fight, to work, and to sacrifice like every other patriotic American group. They do not deserve to be made the pawns of propagandists whose game, unwittingly, happens to lend aid and comfort to the enemy by stirring up discontent and disunity among our people.

STATE SALES TAXES

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, during the morning hour the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD] indicated in his remarks that he was not satisfied with the protection that the Government was giving his State, California.

California, due to its long coast line, is today receiving more protection from the United States against attack and invasion than any State in the Union; more ships, more planes, more tanks, and more men are in that section of the country and on the high sea off of the coast protecting California than any other place in this country. Despite that, Mr. Speaker, California has had a lobby here for over 2 months, endeavoring to defeat legislation which, if it is defeated, will enable the State of California to bleed the United States Government; to say to the United States Government, "You cannot manufacture; you cannot assemble ships, tanks, planes, or munitions of war in our State unless you pay us a tax." California today has, by far, more national defense contracts than any State in the United States. Its Representative asks for protection and the State wants to charge the Government to manufacture implements to protect the State.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Just a minute and I will give the gentleman from California a chance.

California has more defense contracts than any State in the Union, by far. It has a 3-percent sales tax. When hearings were conducted on this bill the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] brought out the fact from the representative of your State tax division that your sales tax in California had jumped nearly \$40,000,000. Remember you did not get a dollar of taxes in increasing your revenue that you cannot get after this bill passes.

I was the author of the original bill that they are trying to defeat. The last bill, introduced by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], does not take from the State of California \$1. It does not take away one right that the State of California had, up to last November. I repeat that in nearly \$40,000,000 increase in sales taxes, not a dollar of this kind of money was represented.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] also complained about the bill. He said we were trying to take away from his State money that would enable them to construct and maintain roads. Back in 1917 when we started the Federal-aid program for roads it was specifically stated in the organic act that we were participating for the purpose of building roads to be used for military purposes; to build roads to carry the mail. Since

1917 we have an investment in the Federal highways of this country of \$4,400,000,000. Now the hour has arrived when we need them for military purposes, and Utah and California are complaining because we are using them for military purposes without paying them for so doing. What are we using them for in California? To protect the State of California from invasion and attack. Listen to this and remember it. The gasoline tax has not been disturbed in this legislation. In fact, it has been made broader. States will be able to collect more money from the gasoline tax under the terms of this bill than they could have collected last November before the decision of the Supreme Court which makes this legislation necessary.

The States of this Union are not in bad shape. I was in Maryland about a month ago and I heard the Governor of Maryland make a speech. He was talking to real-estate men. He said:

Now I have some good news for you. Next year, due to our financial condition, we are going to reduce the tax on real estate 20 percent.

That is pretty nice.

I was in New York last week end and I read where Governor Lehman announced to the people of New York:

We are not only going to take away that 1-percent emergency tax on income that we had last year, but when you pay your income tax on April 15 this year, that will be wiped out and 25 percent more.

New York this year on the net income of 1941, is reducing taxes 26 percent. It is not like California and Utah and six other States.

My own State, Missouri, collected \$10,000,000 more in sales tax last year than it did the year before. It has gradually gone up. By reason of the tremendous amount of national defense contracts in my State, I predict it will go up \$20,000,000 more this year. It is bound to do so. That is not money coming out of the Federal Treasury. Those taxes were levied on the purchases of skilled and unskilled labor, who receive approximately 50 percent of our national defense expenditures. There is turn-over and turn-over, and each turn-over is taxed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. As I said, there is turnover and turnover, and every time that money is spent you collect sales tax.

That is what is responsible for the increase. I say to you, as I have repeatedly shown in the RECORD, that unless this legislation is passed, two or three billion dollars will be handed out to the States. There are 22 States in this Union today that have a sales tax. Only 8 of those States are asking for taxes. There are 14 States that do not want to bleed the Government, but if we do not pass the legislation, then it behooves all the 48 States of the Union, not counting the

municipalities, to get busy and pass laws so they will get their end of these sales taxes.

Do you think the State of New York, that does not have a sales tax, is going to pay all the taxes it pays to the Federal Treasury and let other States in the Union collect money for national defense expenditures without New York's acting? Why, of course it is not. These gentlemen who are talking about this legislation will do well to investigate and read the bill and not listen to some State officials as to what the bill contains. Now I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH].

Mr. ROLPH. The gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD] does not need any defense at my hands. I am surprised to hear the statements made by the gentleman from Missouri, from the city of St. Louis, which really sponsored California, for many of the covered wagons outfitted in St. Louis and came out in 1848 and 1849 to build up California. The gentleman ought to be proud to think that the State of California is now fifth in population and fifth in wealth and that it is one of 8, 9, or 10 of the States of the country that are putting more money into the Federal Treasury than they are taking out.

I do not know of any lobby here in Washington that has been lobbying against the gentleman's bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. I have been before the committees many times, but I have never been before a committee where there was any question touching taxes but what the California men were there; in fact, before the Rules Committee the other day there were so many Representatives from California that I said to one of them: "You had better change your song from 'California, Here I Come,' to 'California, Here I Am,'" because most of your delegation was there opposing this rule. The gentleman was not there but many of his colleagues were there.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. ROLPH. I am one Representative from California who was not before the committee. If the gentleman wants to know why California has so many contracts it is because California has the plants and California has the goods. We have the plants, and that is the reason we have the contracts.

Mr. COCHRAN. Those Californians who are fighting this bill ought to be ashamed of themselves for the way you are attempting to tax the Federal Government. If I were a Californian I would be lowering my head in shame at what the State officials are trying to do to the Federal Government at this time. If the people of my State try to do to the Federal Government what the people of California are doing I will condemn them just as severely as I condemn the officials of California.

Everytime you tax a contractor that tax is added to the cost and is passed to the Federal Government and paid by the Federal Government. This legislation is not a bill to protect contractors but to protect the Federal Treasury and ex-

pedite production. Read the bill before you condemn it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. One reason for taking this time is to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] the question whether he is striving for unity, whether he is trying to get California back into the Union if she has been out? I did not know she was ever out.

Mr. COCHRAN. California ought to get out of the Union if it will not go along—if she persists in her taxing of the Federal Government that protects her.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman further if he wants to make another declaration that California ought to get out of the Union. Now, tell us why.

Mr. ROLPH. I was just going to ask that question.

Mr. COCHRAN. Who are we fighting the war for if not the 48 States. California wants to tax the Government for the privilege of manufacturing munitions of war to be used to protect California.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I supposed the war was being fought for the preservation of the United States of America.

Mr. COCHRAN. What is the United States of America other than the 48 States?

Mr. HOFFMAN. And it is being fought, we were told, to extend the "four freedoms" to all the world, including India. Believing, of course, as I do that Great Britain should soon grant independence to India if the "four freedoms" are to be carried to all the world, I hope she will not wait until it is too late.

I want also to say that the statement of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. Norton] was another great unity speech, especially that part of it where she charged directly—or if not directly, at least indirectly and by inference—that those of us who wanted labor legislation were inspired by the Nazis. Now, that surely will smooth things over, will it not? It is right in line with the statement that Mr. Walling made Saturday in New York to the effect that these letters we have been receiving demanding labor legislation came from Nazi propagandists. I want to read a copy of a letter which was sent to me, the original of which was sent to the President of the United States. It is from the McDonald Dairy. Omitting the salutation, it reads:

McDONALD DAIRY CO.,
Flint, Mich., March 18, 1942.

It is you who are misinformed. Make no mistake about it. The people of this country understand that men can work more than 40 hours if they want to, so far as the law is concerned, if they are paid enough.

The people are much better informed than you are because they know in Flint, for instance, that night before last the Fisher

Body local, United Automobile Workers, passed a resolution against working any faster in the war effort. The resolution was published in the newspaper. They know that on the tank plant the surveyor rodman was stopped from driving his own stakes and a needless man sent along to drive them. They know that bricklayers are restricted ridiculously in the number of bricks they are permitted to lay in a day on some Government projects. They know that union men prevent their fellow workers turning out the amount of work that can be done very comfortably. They know that Robert Travis, who called a strike in a California bomber plant, causing you to send soldiers there, is now in a key position in the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and Flint people know that this is the same Robert Travis that caused the switches to be pulled in the electric power plants supplying Flint.

Misinformation there certainly is, but it is not on the part of the people who see and know these things first hand. We don't get our information from William Green, or Philip Murray, or John Lewis, head of the Workers and Peasant Party. We can lose this war. In fact, we are losing this war. You had better let Congress alone in this matter of bringing about more work. More work is one of the things essential to winning and paying for the war.

Yours very truly,

W. A. McDONALD.

Now, I will say to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Norton] that she gets just nowhere except into trouble by calling names. If she, or any other new dealer or Communist, thinks she or they are the only loyal citizens, then they having ears hear not, having eyes they see not.

Neither she nor anyone else is frightening anyone by falsely charging others with a lack of patriotism. Such charges are not only silly but show a self-satisfied complex that is amusing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein the letter referred to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech recently made by Judge Leo H. Leary, of Boston, Mass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

L. METCALFE WALLING

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the name of L. Metcalfe Walling was mentioned three or four times here today, and I want to inform the House that Mr. Walling is a constituent of mine, and I want to say a word about this young man who has been maligned here on this floor for the horrible crime of standing up for the man who works for a living.

Metcalfe Walling, who was recently appointed as Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor, has had a great deal of training for the post he occupies. His appointment was not a flash in the pan, but came about because of his long, hard work in his chosen field—that of labor relations.

He was born a member of a conservative Republican family, in December 1908, in the town of North Smithfield—one of my State's oldest and most conservative towns. He was graduated from Phillips-Exeter Academy in Andover, Mass., and received his degree from Brown University in 1930. He received his LL. B. from Harvard Law School in 1933. The following year he was admitted to the bar of the State of Rhode Island.

He was named labor compliance officer and legal adviser to the N. R. A., and in 1935 was named director of labor for the State of Rhode Island, while the present junior Senator from Rhode Island was the Governor of my State. During this period, with Senator GREEN in the executive office, the present Lt. Comdr. Robert E. Quinn, the State's Lieutenant Governor, and Metcalfe Walling, the State's director of labor, there was enacted the greatest program of social legislation my State had ever known. In fact, it was the greatest such program any State had put into action in such a short period of time. There was enacted a minimum-wage law—48 hours for women and children—a child-labor law—and mind you, a child-labor law which was considered the finest in the country. There was set up for the first time a special division of women and children in the department of labor. The State set up its unemployment compensation division, and enacted many far-reaching amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act, including an amendment providing for occupational diseases, which inclusion had hitherto been frowned upon. The State enacted a prevailing wage law for public works—roads and bridge construction—and set up the State and Federal reemployment agencies.

There were more accomplishments—many of which never saw print—but many of which are deeply imbedded in the minds of the people of the State who saw themselves receiving the treatment which is accorded decent citizens of the State, and with no one making excuses for according them that treatment to which they were entitled.

Metcalfe Walling, in 1937, was named head of the Public Contracts Division of the Labor Department, and headed the administration of the Walsh-Healey Act. He has served in that capacity with honor and distinction until his recent appointment to the Wages and Hours Division.

Here men, elected by the people to serve the peoples' interest, are preaching unity and doing their level best to destroy the greatest exhibition of unity that this country has ever witnessed. Gentlemen from Michigan, Georgia, and Virginia stand here and renew their attacks on labor and find they have willing followers in men who are misguided by the press of the country, who in its zeal to follow past paths and continue the de-

struction of labor, as usual, are rapping every member of organized labor, even though in the State blamed for the inauguration of this alleged crusade—Oklahoma—there has never been a strike in a defense industry. These men stand here and attack a young man whose greatest sin is that he has the courage of his conviction and he follows truth, and serves truth, no matter what the consequences and no matter whose toes are stepped on. Do you plead the cause of subservient men? Do you ask for men who can be dictated to by the press—the press who will serve itself first, no matter what the consequences? Or do you want a man who recognizes justice and fair play—and who knows, in all this cry of doing away with the 40-hour week, that there is in the country an army of over 4,000,000 unemployed—this in the midst of the greatest demand for workers the country has ever seen?

This is not a member of organized labor who has been attacked here on this floor; this is a member of your Government and my Government. This is a man who is trying to serve his country, and who has proved by past performances his ability to serve his country well and faithfully.

This is a man who tries to defeat his country's enemies' attempts to undermine our unity, to show a solid front to the enemy, and as his reward for his faith in his fellow man he receives from this—this high tribunal of the House of Representatives—ridicule and abuse. If that is serving the country's cause, then I have been gravely misled.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HARE, for 3 days, on account of death in family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Daily Commercial News entitled, "A New Era Dawns on the Water Front."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, for nearly half a century the Daily Commercial News has served the business and commercial fields in San Francisco. This interesting paper is published every day except Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays.

Theo F. Coleman is its energetic capable editor and on March 16, 1942, he wrote an editorial captioned "A new era dawns on the water front."

The article sets forth a spirit of complete cooperation in San Francisco's shipping industry for all-out effort to win the war.

The Maritime Industry Board mentioned in the article will settle by decision within its own membership any questions in dispute.

Americans everywhere I am sure will be interested in reading Mr. Coleman's editorial which follows:

[From the San Francisco Daily Commercial News of March 16, 1942]

A NEW ERA DAWNS ON THE WATER FRONT

The power to increase longshore efficiency in the loading and discharging of vessels in Pacific coast ports.

The power to waive collective bargaining agreements "and any rights therein of either party" if such agreements interfere with the war effort.

The power to promulgate its own rules and regulations for the performance of its duties.

These, in substance, are the powers of the Pacific Coast Maritime Industry Board, created last week by executive order of Admiral Emory S. Land, with full approval of President Roosevelt.

Admiral Land acted after consulting with Dean Wayne L. Morse, a public member of the National War Labor Board and coastwise arbitrator under the Congress of Industrial Organizations longshore contract.

He established the board as an agency of the War Shipping Administration, of which he is chairman. He made it clear that he had but one purpose in mind—"to raise production levels of the longshore industry of the Pacific coast to the maximum."

Explaining the situation more fully, Dean Morse in a recent address before an assembly at the University of Oregon, where he is dean of the law school, had this to say:

"For the past 6 years there have been quarrels and wrangles over employer claims of a slow-down and union claims of a speed-up. As far as I am concerned as arbitrator under the longshore contract, I want to hear no more of that argument."

"I want, the country wants, our armed forces have the right to expect a longshore speed-up and more speed-up, and then some more."

"I have allowed the longshoremen under present conditions wages sufficiently high so that they should have every incentive to exert the maximum of energy and effort in clearing our west-coast docks of cargo just as fast as there are ships in which to put it."

The board is definitely an instrument of the United States Government. And never before in the history of American labor relations has any such board been given powers more sweeping or far-reaching than those held by this agency.

Morse is chairman of the board but will leave actual running of the organization to his personally selected vice chairman, Professor Paul Elie, director of industrial relations at Stanford University, who, in the absence of the chairman, will have full power in all decisions, voting in the Chairman's place.

Besides the chairman and vice chairman, the board will consist of four regular members, two representing employers and two representing labor.

In addition, there will be six alternates. Two will stand by for the employer members, two for the Congress of Industrial Organizations International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union and two for the American Federation of Labor International Longshoremen's Association, who will sit on the board in place of Congress of Industrial Organizations members when the agency is considering disputes or investigations in the American Federation of Labor ports of Tacoma, Anacortes, and Port Angeles.

All appointments are made by Admiral Land, but unions and employers will nominate members they seek to have represent them. It is understood that both sides already have made nominations. Admiral Land is not required to follow the recommendations, but it is expected he will. Thus far Dean Morse and Professor Elie are the only two persons actually named to the board. The other appointments will be made shortly.

The board marks the beginning of a new era in labor relations on Pacific coast docks. It has the power to suspend obsolete and cumbersome working rules in order to speed up production. It must and will use that power.

THEO. F. COLEMAN.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6543. An act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the production of alcohol.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1696. An act for the relief of Bessie Walden; and

S. 2208. An act to further expedite the prosecution of the war.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 20, 1942:

H. R. 6758. An act to provide a penalty for violation of restrictions or orders with respect to persons entering, remaining in, leaving, or committing any act in military areas or zones.

On March 23, 1942:

H. R. 6543. An act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the production of alcohol.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 24, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds on Tuesday, March 24, 1942, at 10 a. m., for consideration of H. R. 6483. The hearing will be held in room 1304, New House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, March 24, 1942. Business to be considered: Hearings on H. R. 6799, flying hours of air pilots.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, April 14, 1942. Business to be considered: Hearings along the line of the Sanders bill, H. R. 5497, and other matters connected with the Federal Communications Commission.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold a hearing at

10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, March 25, 1942, and H. R. 6529 and private bills.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1520. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1942, to remain available until June 30, 1943, amounting to \$1,700,000, for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 682); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1521. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers, consisting of 142 items, which certain Government agencies have recommended for disposal; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1522. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to the status of certain natives and inhabitants of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1523. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to discharge more effectively the obligations of the United States under certain treaties relating to the manufacture and distribution of narcotic drugs, by providing for domestic control of the production and distribution of the opium poppy and its products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1524. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Acting Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 30, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of, and a review of report on the Saco River, Maine, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936, and requested by resolutions of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on March 27, 1936, and the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted on March 28, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1525. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to \$366,370, in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 683); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1526. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, 1941; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1527. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the temporary appointment or advancement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, H. R. 5784. A bill to consolidate police and municipal courts of District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1934). Ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6812) for the relief of Robert C. Duff; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 6810) granting a pension to Amelia Branson; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 6818. A bill authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6819. A bill to provide that written statements required by the Civil Service Commission may be made without the formality of an oath, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 6820. A bill to provide for the closing of certain foreign language schools in time of war; to the Committee on Education.

H. R. 6821. A bill to promote the defense of the United States by prohibiting the conducting of foreign language schools; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. BEITER:

H. R. 6822. A bill to extend the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act to certain persons, and to the widows, children, and dependents of certain persons, injured while fighting fires on property under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 6823. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to expedite the prosecution of the war effort," approved December 18, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 6824. A bill to make temporary disability ratings of World War veterans permanent after 10 years; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. POWERS:

H. R. 6825. A bill to provide for the award to civilians of the Lincoln Cross and the Lincoln Medal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 6826. A bill to provide for the reclassification under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 of employees engaged in war production participating in strikes; to make it unlawful for persons to conspire to stop or slow down production in war contracts; to suspend the 40-hour week and provisions for overtime compensation; to limit the profits on war contracts; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GEHRMANN:

H. R. 6827. A bill subjecting the Indians of the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin to laws of the respective States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 6828. A bill to amend Public Act 274 of October 16, 1941 (ch. 445, sec. I, 55 Stat. 742), entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the

United States"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 6829. A bill to equalize the rates of pay of all personnel in the United States Army, the Philippine Scouts, and the Philippine Commonwealth Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 6830. A bill to provide emergency relief for certain tornado victims and for the restoration and reconstruction of certain devastated areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 6831. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 6832. A bill to repeal section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 6833. A bill for the purpose of conserving gasoline and oil; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 6834. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 6835. A bill to remove limitations on the hours of employment during the continuance of the present war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHELCHER:

H. R. 6836. A bill to readjust the compensation of men in the armed forces of the United States of America; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 6837. A bill to amend section 43, title 2, United States Code, relating to mileage of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 6838. A bill to amend the Banking Act of 1876, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 6839. A bill to provide for the appointment in the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves of persons with physical disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN:

H. R. 6840. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 464. Resolution to appoint a committee to investigate pro-Nazi charge; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. Res. 465. Resolution to establish a special committee to investigate the payment of fees and dues as a condition of employment on national defense projects with a view to presenting legislation to the Congress to curb and correct such practices; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York memorializing the President and the Congress of the United

States to pass legislation to change the laws and regulations affecting the border between this country and Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 6841. A bill for the relief of The Tours Apartment Hotel; to the Committee on Claims

By Mr. MACIEJEWSKI:

H. R. 6842. A bill for the relief of Robert J. Eitel, Max Eitel, and E. J. Coyle, of Chicago, Ill., a copartnership doing business under the name of the C. & E. Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER:

H. R. 6843. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manfred Sakel; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 6844 (by request). A bill for the relief of Emil Chalupa; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2584. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the American Legion, C. C. Thomas Navy Post, No. 244, San Francisco, Calif., regarding war production; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2585. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, respectfully requesting Congress to speedily bring about and put into effect any necessary changes in our laws and regulations affecting the border between this country and Canada to the end that unnecessary restrictions may be removed and that travel of persons and movement of products may be facilitated for the purpose of promoting a harmonious, an efficient, and a victorious prosecution of the existing war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2586. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of 2,536 members of the Northwestern Union of Telephone Workers, protesting against inclusion of the Bell System pension plan under the pending Morgenthau tax proposal for pension trust funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2587. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the New York State Legislature, requesting Congress to effect any necessary changes in our laws and regulations affecting the border between this country and Canada to the end that unnecessary restrictions may be removed and movement of persons and products facilitated for the purpose of promoting the harmonious, efficient, and victorious prosecution of the existing war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2588. By Mr. KEOGH: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, respectfully requesting the Congress to speedily bring about and put into effect any necessary changes in our laws and regulations affecting the border between this country and Canada to the end that unnecessary restrictions may be removed and that travel of persons and movement of products may be facilitated for the purpose of promoting a harmonious and efficient and a victorious prosecution of the existing war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2589. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Eagle Rock (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce, urging the speedy removal of aliens from along the Pacific coast line to interior concentrations, isolating them from both the coast line and water-supply sources where sabotage would most likely occur; also urging the Congressmen to take a firm and positive stand against strikes of any kind that interfere with

the war production program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2590. Also, petition of the Fresno (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce, urging immediate removal of all aliens and Japanese citizens or aliens into protective custody of the United States, and that all property of such persons be taken into protective custody of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2591. By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of sundry citizens of Hendersonville, N. C., supporting Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2592. By the SPEAKER: Petition of L. A. Nordan, of San Antonio, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the wage-hour law; to the Committee on Labor.

2593. Also, petition of the Council of the City of Cincinnati, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bills 6617 and 6750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2594. Also, petition of the assistant secretary, State Board of Agriculture of the State of California, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to construction of dams necessary to the Central Valley project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

2595. Also, petition of the American Legion, Middletown Post, No. 218, Middletown, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to all-out aid and unity to win the war; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 24, 1942

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 5, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, the Very Reverend Z^cBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Ruler of the nations, we entreat Thee in this hour of the world's anguish to have pity upon us, for in Thee is our only hope. Inspire in us, Thy children, the courage to do and to dare our utmost; increase our faith in the religion of our Saviour, which alone can subdue the world by its transmutation of suffering into triumph, of a crown of thorns into a crown of glory, of a shameful cross into a symbol of salvation.

In this Passiontide, dear Lord, teach us anew the mysterious meaning of the cross which brings to men the death of death, the defeat of sin, the beatification of martyrdom, the raising heavenward of voluntary sacrifice, the defiance of pain. Give to us all the certitude which sets no store by the apparent or the tangible, but which, piercing through the mystery of things, shows us joy shining through tears, making of suffering a sacred trial sent by Eternal Love to purify the souls of men. We ask it for the sake of Him in whom dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MEAD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal

of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, March 23, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on March 23, 1942, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1564. An act for the relief of Pauline Caton Robertson;

S. 1898. An act for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Nazaria Garcia, of Winslow, Ariz.;

S. 1906. An act for the relief of the estate of O. K. Himley; and

S. 2134. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the State of Michigan, acting through the International Bridge Authority of Michigan, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches there-to, across the St. Marys River from a point in or near the city of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to a point in the Province of Ontario, Canada," approved December 16, 1940.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5444. An act to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6386. An act to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to conform with the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia, and also to conform with wages paid in many cities of the Nation; and

H. R. 6782. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to assign officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force to duty in the detective bureau of the Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 2203) to further expedite the prosecution of the war, and it was signed by the Vice President.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. CAPPER presented petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Abilene and Fort Scott, Kans., praying for the prompt enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask consent to now present for appropriate disposition a petition signed by various citizens of the State of Maine, praying for the enactment of Senate bill No. 860, known as the Sheppard bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petition presented by the